DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 053 SP 026 515

AUTHOR Emmer, Edmund T.; And Others
TITLE Improving Classroom Management and Organization in Junior High Schools: An Experimental Investigation. R&D Report No. 6153.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 82
GRANT OB-NIE-G-80-0116-P2
NOTE 249p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; *Inservice Teacher Education; Junior High Schools; *Program Effectiveness; Student Behavior; Teacher Behavior; *Teaching Styles
IDENTIFIERS Texas

ABSTRACT

The Junior High Management Improvement Study involved two urban school districts in two southwestern cities during the 1981-82 school year. In this field experiment on classroom management, experimental group teachers (n=18) and control group teachers (n=20) in four content areas received a manual and attended two workshops at the beginning of the school year. Extensive classroom observation of both groups provided a basis for assessing implementation of recommended management practices. The effects of the use of the recommended practices on student cooperation and task engagement were also assessed. Additional research questions investigated relationships between management behaviors and student behavior criteria and assessed impact of several context variables on management outcomes. Based on observations in the first two months of school, significant treatment effects were obtained in most of the nine areas of management addressed in the training materials and workshops. Treatment group teachers used the recommended management practices significantly more and established classes with more appropriate, task-oriented student behavior. Results provided evidence of the effectiveness of most of the recommended management practices, and suggest that research-based teacher education on classroom management could help many teachers establish better learning environments in junior high and middle school classes. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Improving Classroom Management and Organization In Junior High Schools: An Experimental Investigation

Edmund T. Emmer
Julie P. Sanford
Barbara S. Clements
Jeanne Martin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Improving Classroom Management and Organization

In Junior High Schools:

An Experimental Investigation

Edmund T. Emmer
Julie P. Sanford
Barbara S. Clements
Jeanne Martin

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

(R&D Rep. No. 6153)

December, 1982

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

This study was supported in part by the National Institute of Education, Contract OB-NIE-G-80-0116, P2, Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching Project. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the NIE and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred. Requests for reprints should be addressed to: Communication Services, R&DCTE, Education Annex 3.203, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

SP 026515

Abstract

In this field experiment on classroom management in junior high and middle school grades, experimental group teachers in four content areas received a manual and two workshops at the beginning of the school year. Extensive classroom observations of both the experimental teachers (n = 18) and the control group teachers (n = 20) provided a basis for assessing implementation of recommended management practices. Observations also assessed the effects of use of the recommended practices on student cooperation and task engagement. Teacher interviews and questionnaires provided additional information about teachers' use of the training materials. Additional research questions investigated relationships between management behaviors and student behavior criteria and assessed impact of several context variables on management outcomes.

Results of the study confirmed the importance of most of the areas of classroom management that had previously been identified by descriptive/correlational research in junior high schools. Based on observations in the first 2 months of school, significant treatment effects were obtained in most of the nine areas of management addressed in the training materials and workshops. Treatment group teachers used the recommended management practices significantly more and established classes with more appropriate, task oriented student behavior. Middle-of-the-year results were inconclusive because of sample attrition, and results were poor for a small separate subsample of experienced teachers (six experimental and four control group) with

histories of management difficulties. Nevertheless, results of the study for the main sample of teachers provided evidence of the effectiveness of most of the recommended management practices, and results suggest that research based teacher education on classroom management could help many teachers establish better learning environments in junior high and middle school classes.

Acknowledgments

The Junior High Management Improvement Study was the product of the efforts of many people in addition to the coauthors. One staff member whose contribution we gratefully recognize is Murray Worsham, who coordinated all study operations in the study site in San Antonio, Texas. She also assisted in preparation of teacher training materials, recruited and helped train observers, assisted in the conduct of teacher workshops, and served as a classroom observer and teacher interviewer. The success of the study in the San Antonio site was due in large measure to Ms. Worsham's competence and dedication.

Two school districts participated in the study, Austin Independent School District in Austin, Texas, and Northside Independent School District in San Antonio, Texas. In the Austin Independent School District, we would like to give special thanks for the cooperation and support of Dr. Freda M. Holley, Director of the Office of Research and Evaluation and, from the Division of Secondary Instruction, Mr. Lawrence Buford, Dr. David Hill, and Ms. Maud Sims. In Northside Independent School District, we would like to thank Mr. Paul Fleming and Mr. Richard Pipes for their assistance and support. We especially want to acknowledge the important contribution made by the principals and participating teachers from the junior high and middle schools in the two districts.

The capable asssistance of the following people in data collection, reduction and analysis is gratefully acknowledged: Patricia Bruton, Carol Emmer, Randall Hickman, Cindy Holder, Nancy Johnson, Ruth Kelly, Peter Kovatis, Angie Ladogana, Richard Poe,

Nancy Biggers, Linda Bishop, Joe Ellison, Marian Higgins, Betty Kerterson, Cathy Rhudy, Douglas Butler, Patricia Conquest, Laurie Dingman, Barbara French, Margie Gaines, Patricia Galindo, Nancy Grohman, Pamela Lam-Yip, Steve Lansdowne, and Ellen Vevier.

In addition, we would like to thank all of the R&DCTE staff who helped in the important task of organizing and checking data, transcribing data, preparing and delivering observation schedules, typing the teacher's manual and other training materials, coordinating production of the manual, and providing support and assistance where needed. Instrumental in the success of all these efforts were Paula M. Willis, Kitty Hays, and Judy Camps.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Background for the JMIS 3

The Classroom Management Function 3

Junior High School Management Studies 7

Context Effects 11

Summary 13

Statement of the Problem 13

Methods 17

Sample 17

Treatment Design 19

Data Collection 24

Observation Instruments 25

Other Data 30

Results 31

Treatment Implementation 31

Effects on Student Behavior 37

Treatment Effects in January-February 38

A Check for Halo 40

Other Results 41

Discussion 44

Implementation 44

Implementation Evidence from the Interviews 49

Factors Affecting Implementation 51

Limitations 52

The Experienced-Management Problem Teachers 53

Management Practices 55

Class Context Effects 63

Summary and Implications 65

List of Tables

Number	Title	Page
1	Years of Teaching Experience for JMIS Teachers	77
2	Subject Areas Taught by JMIS Teachers	78
3	Grade Levels of JMIS Classes	79
4	Reliability Estimates of Student Engagement Ratings	80
5	Reliability Estimates of Observer Summary Ratings	81
6	Reliability Estimates of Component Ratings	83
7	Reliability Estimates of Narrative Reader Ratings	86
8	Indicators of Manual Implementation	88
9	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance of Classroom Management Variables	94
10	Differences Between Experimental and Control Group Teachers on Variables Potentially Susceptible to Halo Errors, But Not Directly Related to the Treatment	95
11	Indicators of Manual Implementation for Experienced-Management Problem Teachers	96
12	Comparison of Experimental and Control Group Mean Differences for the Main Sample and the Experienced-Management Problem Subsample	102
13	Treatment Teachers' Responses to the Management Manual Questionnaire	105
14	Intercorrelation of Measures of Student Cooperation and Task Engagement	107
15	Correlation of Indicators of Manual Implementation with Measures of Student Cooperation and Task Engagement	108
16	Summary Statistics for Treatment and Control Group Classes for Context Variables	114
17	Correlations between Context Variables and Effectiveness Criteria	115

List of Appendices

A An outline of the contents of the management manual

B Description of the workshop activities and materials

C Management manual questionnaire

D Instructions for preparing a Narrative Record

E Training manual for the Student Engagement Rate form

F Training manual for Component Rating forms

G Observer Ratings of Teachers forms

H Narrative Reader Rating forms

I Interview questions

J Means and ANOVA results for Weeks 1-8, all variables, by instrument (Tables A-E)

Successful classroom organization and management in junior high or middle schools presents a formidable challenge to teachers, who must elicit and maintain the cooperation and involvement of 25 to 30 students in five or more classes each day. Within rigid school schedules, teachers lead students through complex instructional activities, provide and utilize a variety of materials and equipment, handle many administrative chores, give assignments, collect students' work, assess students' progress, keep records, and maintain the classroom's materials and supplies. Managing all of these instructional and noninstructional activities to meet the disparate needs of 130 or more active adolescents requires effort and skill.

At all public school grade levels, effective classroom management has been recognized as a crucial element in effective teaching. If a teacher cannot obtain students' cooperation and involve them in instructional activities, it is unlikely that effective teaching will take place (Doyle, 1979; Lortie, 1975; Brophy, Note 1; Good, Note 2). In addition, poor management wastes class time, reduces student time on task, and detracts from the quality of the learning environment. Research has demonstrated that both classroom time use variables and teacher management behaviors are related to student learning gains (Borg, 1980; Good, 1979; Medley, 1977; Rosenshine, 1979; Good, Note 2).

Given the crucial role of classroom organization and management, it is disturbing that recent polls by Gallup and the National Education Association indicate that classroom management (at least in the form of student discipline problems) is viewed by teachers, administrators, and the American public as a source of serious problems. In a survey of

over 2600 teachers and principals about teacher needs and sources of proficiency development, classroom management was ranked first (of 26 items) as a competency needed by teachers, and last as a competency effectively addressed by teacher education institutions (Pigge, 1978).

This report describes a large scale study that directly addresses the need for more information about effective management in junior high and middle school classrooms. The Junior High Management Improvement Study (JMIS) was conducted during 1981-82 to find out whether classroom management strategies derived from earlier correlational-descriptive research could help teachers improve their management competencies, and whether such changes would result in improved student behavior, including increased student engagement and cooperation. Experimental group teachers received a manual and two workshops at the beginning of the school year, and researchers subsequently made extensive classroom observations of both the experimental teachers and a control group of teachers who did not receive the training until the end of the study. Classroom observations measured the extent to which the teachers used the recommended management strategies and assessed the effects of use of the recommended strategies on student cooperation and task engagement. A total of 61 teachers in grades six through eight in 14 schools in two school districts participated.

This report presents an overview of the JMIS and its results and a discussion of results with regard to the major questions and hypotheses of the study. The following section of the report discusses the management function of teachers in the context of research and theory on effective instruction, describes the descriptive and correlational research that led to the present field experiment, and addresses the

issue of classroom contextual effects on management. Several thorough reviews and discussions of the literature on classroom management and organization are available and are recommended to the reader who desires a broad perspective of the field (Brophy & Putnam, 1979; Doyle, in press; Duke, 1979, 1982; Emmer, in press; Emmer & Evertson, 1981; Goss & Ingersoll, 1981; Brophy, Note 1).

Background

The Classroom Management Function

Teaching effectiveness literature from the past 10 years suggests the importance of classroom conditions that depend directly on the ability of teachers to organize and manage the classroom: productive use of class time (Borg, 1980; Frederick & Walberg, 1980), student attention to or involvement with learning activities, a goal-oriented, structured classroom environment, and opportunities for students to interact with the teacher in instructional activities of appropriate difficulty levels (Bloom, 1976; Brophy, 1979; Fisher, Berliner, Filby, Marliave, Cahen, & Dishaw, 1980; Good, 1979; Medley, 1977; Rosenshine, 1979; Good, Note 2). Asserting that these apparently essential conditions for effective teaching depend on teacher management competencies raises the question of the relationship between classroom management and instruction. Brophy (1982) commented on the fact that the two aspects of good teaching appear to be inseparable:

> A second basic assumption is that good classroom management implies good instruction, and vice versa. Recent research makes very clear that successful classroom management involves not merely responding effectively when problems occur but preventing problems from occur-

ring very frequently at all. In turn, this prevention is accomplished primarily by good planning, curriculum pacing, and instruction that keeps students profitably engaged in appropriate academic activities. Furthermore, instruction is involved in much of the activity that would ordinarily be described as classroom management, as when teachers provide their students with instruction and an opportunity to practice the procedures to be used during everyday classroom routines. We can discuss classroom management apart from instruction in the formal curriculum, but in practice these key teaching tasks are interdependent. (pp. 2-3)

Doyle (1979) also described the impact of management considerations on teachers' selection of subject matter and planning of instructional activities.

Management and instruction are clearly not synonymous, however. A number of writers have asserted and provided illustrations of the fact that while good classroom management may be necessary for good instruction, it does not guarantee it (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Emmer & Evertson, 1981; Emmer, Note 3). Classroom management, for example, does not encompass the selection of learning objectives, the match between learning objectives and classroom activities, general considerations of content coverage, pupil diagnosis, and selection of instructional content and teaching strategies, except when these directly affect the ability or willingness of students to engage in activities in the classroom. In addition, some of the management tasks carried out by teachers are not aimed at achieving instructional goals, but are instead aimed at school goals other than academic achievement (e.g., student acquisition of social skills) or are dictated by the nature of the

situation in which schooling takes place. Evertson and Emmer's (1982) comment is apropos:

> An appreciation for how the characteristic of a setting might influence classroom processes and behaviors, whose ostensible goal is promotion of student learning, can be gained by considering a non-educational example. Imagine how a pediatrician's task would be changed if, at 8:00 a.m., he or she was greeted by 30 children with assorted disorders in a single room from which no one was allowed to leave until 3:00 p.m. except for lunch. (p. 4)

One assumes that the novel situation described above would require the initiation of some activities not directly resulting in diagnosis and treatment of illnesses. Only by formulating some workable procedures and maintaining the children's cooperation in them would the primary business of the doctor be feasible, a situation roughly analogous to that faced by a classroom teacher.

Classroom management, therefore, includes all of the things that teachers do (proactively as well as in response to student behavior) to secure and maintain student cooperation and involvement in classroom activities, both instructional and noninstructional. Logical criteria of management effectiveness under this definition are measures of student engagement or involvement in activities and classroom freedom from disruptive or inappropriate student behavior. One or more of these criteria has frequently been used in research, resulting in the identification of a number of instructional and/or management variables related to these measures, e.g., characteristics of lessons or activity formats (Kounin & Doyle, 1975), the rate of content presentation (Carnine, 1976), structure during transitions between activities

(Arlin, 1979), interactive instruction (Fisher et al., 1980), and consistent use of consequences (Benowitz & Busse, 1976). The behavior modification literature contains many examples of research focusing on student task engagement or disruptive behavior. While many studies from that literature were conducted in laboratory or otherwise atypical settings, some were conducted in regular classroom settings. For example, Jones, Fremouw, and Carples (1977) conducted teacher training experiments that demonstrated the effect of teacher strategies for limit setting, monitoring student behavior, stopping disruptive behavior quickly, giving assistance during seatwork, and reinforcing on-task behavior in elementary classrooms.

Studies that afford a comprehensive picture of classroom management in typical school settings include Kounin's (1970) well known study and large scale studies conducted by the Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching Project (now named the Classroom Learning and Teaching Program) at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, the University of Texas at Austin. Kounin analyzed videotapes of 49 first and second grade classrooms and coded the behavior of selected children for work involvement and deviancy. He identified several dimensions of teacher management behavior that laid the groundwork for further classroom management research: Teacher withitness (or of awareness and prompt desistance of deviant student behavior), smoothness and momentum during lesson presentations, group alerting and student accountability, and, during student seatwork activities, seatwork variety and challenge.

Building upon Kounin's work and related findings from teaching effectiveness research, Emmer, Evertson, and Anderson (1980) conducted a

descriptive study of 28 elementary classrooms that included extensive observations starting on the first day of school and continuing throughout the year. At the end of the study, identification of effective and less effective teachers (in terms of student behavior criteria, other teacher management criteria, and classroom achievement gains) and analysis of classroom data for these groups resulted in identification of effective classroom management strategies for establishing and maintaining good learning environments in elementary schools. Subsequently a large scale experimental study in grades one through six confirmed the importance of most of the variables identified in the descriptive study (Evertson, Emmer, Sanford, Clements, & Martin, in press).

Junior High School Management Studies

Relatively few longitudinal studies of classroom management in junior high grades have been conducted. One exception was a study by Moskowitz and Hayman (1976). This study compared management behaviors of "best" teachers (as nominated by students) and first year teachers in an inner-city junior high school. Classroom observations that began on the first day of school and continued periodically throughout the school year indicated that the two groups differed greatly on student off task behavior and that compared to first year teachers, best teachers used more orienting and climate setting behaviors at the beginning of school, gave more academic reinforcement and encouragement, and were more effective in controlling and responding to student behavior. Observation data in the Moskowitz-Hayman study consisted of Flanders' interaction analysis variables and limited anecdotal records.

The direct precursor of the current experimental study, the Junior High Classroom Organization Study (JHCOS) (Evertson & Emmer, 1982;

Emmer, Note 3) investigated classroom management and organization in seventh and eighth grade English and mathematics classes, using a variety of classroom observation data and outcome measures. A total of 51 teachers in 11 schools participated in the study, providing 102 classrooms: 52 mathematics classes (26 teachers) and 50 English classes (25 teachers).

Classroom data were obtained from an average of 14 1-hour observations per class. Each observation provided quantitative measures of student task engagement, ratings of teacher and student behaviors, and detailed descriptive records of classroom events. Additional information was obtained from teacher interviews and questionnaires, student ratings of the teacher, end-of-year ratings by observers, and school records of students' entering achievement scores. Students' scores on end-of-year achievement tests in mathematics or English were adjusted for entering achievement levels to obtain residual gain scores.

A major focus of the JHCOS was identification of beginning-of-year dimensions of effective classroom management. In order to find out how teachers establish order and create productive learning environments in their classrooms, subsamples of more and less effective teachers were identified, using classroom data obtained after the first 3 weeks of school. Subsample selection criteria included average percent of students coded as off-task, average percent of students coded as on-task in academic activities a management effectiveness score derived from observer end-of-year ratings, and adjusted (residual) class mean achievement. Once identified, the two groups were compared on a variety of measures of teaching behaviors and classroom climate during the first

3 weeks of school and later in the year. Several clusters of variables were found to differentiate more and less effective managers. Results of the JHCOS may be summarized by the following description of practices that were used by effective classroom managers in the study.

Classroom procedures and rules. Effective junior high school classroom managers showed an ability to formulate workable procedures to manage daily classroom activities. Observations during the beginning of the school year indicated that effective managers had procedures and rules that enabled students to function smoothly and successfully in major classroom activities (for example, student participation in discussion, ways for students to get help or attention from the teacher, beginning- and end-of-class routines). Procedures for maintaining student accountability for work and teaching students good work habits received particular attention: overall work requirements and standards, ways of communicating assignments and instructions, methods for monitoring student work in progress, procedures for checking and/or turning in assignments, and procedures for providing students with frequent academic feedback. In addition to a detailed set of classroom procedures, effective managers chose a small number of classroom rules governing general standards of student behavior. They usually posted these rules or presented them in some written form during the first week of school.

Implementation in the first days of school. Compared with elementary teachers, effective secondary classroom managers spent less time teaching students how to behave in their classroom, but they nevertheless systematically introduced students to their classroom procedures and expectations during the first week of school. They planned first

week activities that allowed them to stay actively in charge of the class, maintaining a whole group focus and keeping students involved in activities. They allowed adequate time to present and discuss classroom procedures and rules, to explain their expectations in concrete terms, and to discuss their rationale and consequences. Also, during the first few days they established a positive content focus, often presenting an enthusiastic introduction to the content of the course.

Monitoring. The effective classroom managers were effective monitors. They were aware of how students were behaving in their class, whether students were following procedures and rules, whether they were successfully engaged in learning activities, and whether they were understanding content as it was presented. Teachers who were active and effective monitors tended to move around the room, watching for student attending behaviors, inappropriate behaviors, appropriate materials on student desks, failure to follow directions, signs of confusion or frustration, and student progress on assignments. They did not become so engrossed with one student or one small group that they lost contact with the rest of the class.

Handling inappropriate behavior. Effective classroom managers, in general, stopped inappropriate student behavior quickly and seldom ignored student misbehavior or off task behavior. Their approach was to prevent misbehavior or stop minor misbehavior before it became disruptive. Often they stopped inappropriate behavior by simple interventions: making eye contact, moving closer, silently signaling, reminding a student of what should be done, or quietly telling a student to stop a behavior and then monitoring to be sure that the student complied. When

these simple measures did not stop misbehavior, effective managers used consequences consistently and fairly.

Communicating clearly. Effective classroom managers practiced good communication skills, presenting directions, assignment requirements, and instruction clearly. When they anticipated problems students were likely to have with new material, they organized their instruction into coherent sequences, avoiding interruptions, irrelevancies and digressions. They monitored students' comprehension of directions and instruction during presentations by getting short work samples or by questioning students.

Organizing and pacing instruction. Finally, good classroom managers in the JHCOS organized and paced classroom instructional activities to maximize student engagement and time use. They conducted efficient transitions from one activity to another by using established routines and by carefully monitoring and directing students. They took student attention spans into consideration, alternating periods of seatwork and active instruction during a class period.

Context Effects

The JHCOS and other studies of classroom management and teaching effectiveness (reviewed by Good, 1979; Medley, 1977; Rosenshine, 1979; among others) have demonstrated the importance of teacher effects on classroom learning environment and student outcomes. Teachers are not the only source of influence over classroom processes and outcomes, however. Dunkin and Biddle (1974), Good (Note 2), and others have commented on the importance of investigating classroom context effects. One of the most important context variables appears to the academic ability level of students in the class. That the ability level of the

class as a whole (or the mix of students within the class) has an impact on classroom behavior and/or outcomes has been demonstrated by Beckerman and Good (1981), Evertson (1982), Evertson, Sanford, and Emmer (1981), Metz (1980), and Veldman and Sanford (Note 4). Evertson (1982) and Metz (1980) described classroom management differences between classes of different mean ability levels taught by the same teachers. In lower ability classes teachers had more difficulty maintaining students' cooperation and conducting instructional activities smoothly. Extreme heterogeneity of student ability within classes was also shown to complicate teacher management tasks in junior high schools (Evertson, Sanford, & Emmer, 1981). With a large sample of junior high classes, Veldman and Sanford (Note 4) found more student misbehavior and more frequent procedural and behavior related teacher-student interactions in lower ability classes than in higher ability classes. A case study by Sanford and Evertson (1981) suggested that the teaching of classroom procedures and rules at the beginning of the school year may require more time and attention in low ability or low SES junior high school classrooms than in other classrooms at the same grade levels.

The academic subject or content focus of the classroom is another context variable that affects teacher and student behavior. For example, in the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (McDonald, 1977) and in the Texas Junior High School Study (Evertson, Anderson, & Brophy, Note 5), different relationships between teacher behaviors and student outcomes were found for different content areas (mathematics, English, reading). Doyle (1979) has demonstrated how the nature of different academic tasks (determined in large measure by content objectives) affects students' and teachers' behavior in the classroom.

Summary

In the preceding discussion of the theory and research that led up to the Junior High Management Improvement Study (JMIS), the authors have presented and provided support for a broad definition of classroom management that utilizes student behaviors, specifically task engagement and freedom from disruption, as criteria of classroom management effectiveness. Research using similar student behavior measures was reviewed, along with the large scale junior high school descriptive study that was the basis for the present field experiment. Some context variables that have an impact on classroom management were identified. The research reviewed, particularly the JHCOS results, may be interpreted as implying causal relationships. Most of the research reviewed, however, and all of the junior high school studies, were correlational and/or descriptive, and therefore experimental studies are needed to provide more definitive evidence of causality. Following a now well established research paradigm of descriptive/correlational/experimental studies on effective teaching (see Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1979; Good & Grouws, 1979; Emmer, Sanford, Evertson, Clements, & Martin, Note 6; Crawford & Stallings, Note 7), the JMIS was conducted to verify whether teacher use of classroom management variables identified by previous research would result in the establishment and maintenance of well managed junior high school classrooms. The design, methods, and results of the JMIS are presented in detail in the following sections of this report.

Statement of the Problem

In order to test the effectiveness of recommended classroom management strategies, results of the Junior High Classroom Organization Study

(JHCOS) and related research were used to develop a teacher's manual describing major areas of classroom organization and management in junior high and middle school grades. Extensive descriptive data collected in JHCOS classes provided case studies and examples to help teachers understand the management principles and recommendations. The management manual and two half-day workshops at the beginning of the school year comprised the treatment provided to an experimental group of teachers. A comparison group of teachers received the manual and a workshop after the end of the study. Classroom observations of both groups provided data to test the two general hypotheses of the study.

> Hypothesis 1. Teachers who are provided at the beginning of the school year with a manual and workshops describing effective management behaviors will subsequently exhibit more such behaviors than will teachers not receiving the manual and workshops.

The specific management behaviors referred to Hypothesis 1 are described in the teacher's manual, Organizing and Managing the Junior High School Classroom, whose contents address nine areas of classroom organization and management:

1. Organizing Your Room and Materials for the Beginning of School
2. Developing a Workable Set of Rules and Procedures
3. Student Accountability
4. Consequences
5. Planning Activities for the First Week
6. Maintaining Your Management System
7. Instructional Clarity
8. Organizing Instruction
9. Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups.

Teachers' implementation of recommended behaviors for each area of management were operationalized by classroom observation measures and variables described in a later section.

> Hypothesis 2. Teachers provided with the manual and workshops at the beginning of the school year will establish and maintain better managed classes than will teachers not receiving the manual and workshops.

Better management was operationalized in terms of observed student behavior: higher rates of student engagement in classroom activities, and lower amounts of off task unsanctioned, disruptive, and inappropriate student behavior.

Treatment and control group teachers used to test Hypotheses 1 and 2 were relatively inexperienced, i.e., they have from 0 to 2 years of teaching experience at the beginning of the study. Previous research (Emmer, Sanford, Evertson, Clements, & Martin, Note 6) suggests that relatively inexperienced teachers are the optimum target group for such training. The improvement of classroom management skills of more experienced teachers who have a demonstrated need for improvement was also a question of potential importance to schools, however. Therefore, a small special sample of teachers nominated by their building principals was included in the present study. These teachers' classrooms were not used in the analyses addressing Hypotheses 1 and 2, but were instead the focus of a separate research question.

> Research Question 1. Are the management training materials and workshops effective for teachers who are relatively experienced but who have experienced problems in the area of classroom management?

To address this question separate treatment and comparison groups were formed within the special sample. Because of the small number of

teachers in the sample (n = 10), data analysis was effectively limited to descriptive and case study approaches.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 and Research Question 1 focus on the effects of the experimental intervention on teacher and student behaviors in the classroom. However, the large and varied sample available in the present study provided an opportunity to address other questions as well. For example, to what extent are the management dimensions identified in prior research replicable in this present study's data? This question is important because of the need to accumulate consistent research findings. Also, the treatment was a complex package of recommendations, and previous research (Emmer, Sanford, Evertson, Clements, & Martin, Note 6) suggests that some areas of classroom management may be more amenable to this study's treatment than other areas. Consequently, information about the relationships between specific management recommendations and student behavior criteria aided the interpretation of results. These considerations led to Research Question 2.

> Research Question 2. Will the teacher behavior and activities associated with effective management in earlier research, particularly in the Junior High Classroom Organization Study (JHCOS), also be associated with effective management in the present study?

To answer this question partial correlations controlling for treatment group membership were computed between management effectiveness criteria (student on task, off task unsanctioned, disruptive behavior, and inappropriate behavior measures) and teacher management behaviors derived from classroom observation.

Research Question 2 addressed the question of relationships between teacher and student behaviors in the study sample as a whole (an

approach similar to that used in the JHCOS). It was also desirable, however, to explore further the effects of specific classroom contexts on management relationships.

> Research Question 3. How are the management outcomes affected by the contextual features of classrooms such as (a) subject area, (b) composition of the class, including ethnic and sex proportions, and (c) student entering ability?

Research Question 3a was addressed by comparing the management outcome variables of the four academic core subjects represented in this study: mathematics, science, English, and social studies. This was done using a series of Subject by Group ANOVAs. Reseach Questions 3b and 3c were addressed by computing partial correlations (controlling for group membership) between each context variable and the five student behavior variables identified as management outcomes.

Methods

This section includes a description of the procedures used in the JMIS, including the sample, the study design, data collection procedures, observation instruments, and other forms.

Sample

Two urban school districts in two southwestern cities participated in the study during the 1981-82 school year. One district (District A) had a school population of approximately 50,000 students in grades one through 12; the second district (District B) enrolled approximately 35,000 students in grades one through 12. The ethnic/racial makeup of District A's pupil population was approximately 53% Anglo, 28% Hispanic, and 19% Black. Because of an extensive busing program as well as neighborhood integration, all 10 junior high schools in District A were racially desegregated. All of District A's junior highs were composed

of grades seven and eight. The ethnic/racial makeup of District B's student population was about 60% Anglo, 5% Black, 32% Hispanic, and 3% other. Five middle schools in District B participated, and each of these included grades six through eight.

The main population of teachers who were eligible to participate in the study were those with 2 or fewer years of prior teaching experience. In addition one of the research questions in the study was whether more experienced teachers who had a history of management problems could be helped by the experimental procedures. Therefore, in District A only a second group was identified consisting of experienced teachers nominated by their building principals as experiencing some management problems. The group of teachers with 2 or fewer years of experience are referred to in this report as the Main group; the group of more experienced teachers with management problems are referred to as the Experienced-management problem group.

Recruitment of teachers took place during the 2 weeks prior to the beginning of the school year. In contacts with the teachers by telephone, all relevant details of the study were explained. Teachers in the Experienced-management problem group were told that they had been nominated by their principals as teachers who might find the management training and materials helpful. Teachers were chosen from the subject fields that comprised the academic core: mathematics, English, science,

and social studies.[1] JMIS staff members contacted 48 teachers with 2 or fewer years of experience; 40 of these teachers volunteered for the study. Of 15 Experienced- management problem teachers contacted, 13 volunteered. Not all volunteering teachers were selected because of the need to keep the sample reasonably balanced with respect to factors such as school, years of experience, grade level, and subjects taught. The final number of teachers selected for participation included 38 for the Main group and 10 for the Experienced- management problem group.

Treatment Design

Treatment and control group formation. Teachers were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. In order to maintain approximate balance in experimental and control groups on potentially relevant variables such as years of prior teaching experience, subjects taught, and grade level, teachers were paired according to years of teaching experience and, when possible, grade level and subject taught. Then, members of each pair were assigned randomly to experimental and control conditions, using a table of random numbers. This procedure resulted in 24 teachers assigned to the experimental group and 24 teacher assigned to the control group. The distribution of the two groups by experience, grade level, and subject taught are shown in

---

[1] A small group of teachers in other subjects (e.g., typing, homemaking, special education, speech) were included as a separate subsample in order to provide pilot data on the adaptability of the treatment to settings in which activity patterns might vary from the academic core subjects. Data from these classes are not included in this report but are the basis for case studies in other reports.

Tables 1, 2, and 3. Further information on the composition of classes in the Experimental and Control groups is given in Table 16. As can be seen from data in the table, the composition of the two groups' classes was equivalent, and the classes in both samples were similar to their districts' characteristics on the pupil composition variables.

Sample attrition. Data collection in the classrooms of these teachers was carried out in the two periods: Weeks 1-8 and January-February. Nine teachers were not available for observation in the second time period, for various reasons. Four teachers were lost from the Experimental group for the following reasons: An English teacher was switched to a team teaching arrangement with new students; a math teacher resigned at mid-year; a second math teacher took a pregnancy leave; a science teacher received new classes because she taught half-year courses. Five Control group teachers were lost: two science teachers who taught half-year courses and received new students; another science teacher who resigned during the first semester; a math teacher who was assigned new classes; a social studies teacher who was assigned new classes.

A check of the first 8 weeks' observation data for these teachers indicated that three of the five Control group teachers who were lost to the study were relatively poor managers, whereas the Experimental group teachers who were lost generally appeared to have established well managed classes. Thus, a differential selection bias is present in the January-February samples, making the interpretation of the Main sample results equivocal for that time period. Data for the teachers who were dropped from the sample are presented in the Results section.

Description of treatment procedures. The major component of the JMIS experimental group procedure was teachers' use of the management manual, Organizing and Managing the Junior High Classroom (Emmer, Evertson, Sanford, Clements & Worsham, Note 8) which is based upon prior research conducted in the project. The manual is organized around nine chapters on classroom organization and management. Four chapters focus on planning a good system of management at the beginning of the school year (topics covered are room arrangement, procedures and rules, accountability procedures, and consequences). Three chapters present information on establishing and maintaining a well managed classroom (topics include activities for the first week of classes, monitoring, consistency, and instructional clarity). The final two chapters present information on instructional management (organizing instruction and adjusting instruction for special groups). In each chapter, terms are defined, principles and guidelines are presented, and special recommendations for classroom application are made. To make manual recommendations concrete, numerous case studies are presented along with checklists of specific procedures and activities for room preparation, deciding on rules and procedures, and consequences. An outline of the contents of the manual is provided in Appendix A. Copies of the manual are available from the R&D Center's Communication Services office.

Teachers in the Experimental group in District A were given the manual at a workshop conducted 6 days prior to the first day of classes; in District B teachers received the manual 7 days before school began. The first workshop for teachers in District B occurred 2 days before the first day of school. Teachers in both districts attended a second

workshop during the third week of school. All but two teachers attended the first workshop; two teachers were absent from the second workshop. Both the beginning-of-year and the second workshop were half-day workshops with approximately 2 1/2 hours of actual instruction and discussion.

The workshops were organized to support the use of the manual, rather than for the presentation of additional management strategies. Copies of workshop agendas, outlines, and activity handouts are given in Appendix B. Procedures and activities in the two workshops were the same in Districts A and B. The same workshop leaders were used in both Districts A and B, except that one group leader did not participate in District B's activities. The before-school workshop was designed to introduce and highlight contents of the classroom management manual while encouraging interaction among teachers. The first workshop included an introduction and explanation of the project, including an explanation of the research base for the contents of the manual. A staff member discussed the objectives of the workshop and the organization of contents in the manual.

During the workshop, teachers were divided into three discussion groups. Each group met with a staff member to overview and discuss different sections of the manual: planning rules and procedures, first day activities, or organizing instruction. About 35 minutes of discussion was devoted to each of the three sections. The staff member leading each small group gave a brief overview of the section's contents and led the teachers in a discussion of case studies and issues of concern to them. Teachers were encouraged to ask questions and share suggestions, comments, and experiences about particular management

tasks. The three staff members rotated among the three groups of teachers so that all teachers were introduced to all parts of the manual.

The second workshop was held during the third week of the school year. The purposes of this workshop were to refocus the attention of the teachers on parts of the manual that would be useful throughout the remainder of the school year, and to enable teachers to discuss management problems with other teachers and staff members. Two main areas of focus were identified: instructional organization and behavior management. Staff members prepared brief case studies illustrating specific management problems observed in these two areas. These sketches of classroom situations were used to structure small group, problem solving discussions. As teachers offered solutions and exchanged ideas, staff members pointed out areas in the manual dealing with these problems and offered additional suggestions when possible. Teachers as well as staff members contributed many good suggestions during these discussions. To obtain feedback on the teachers' use of the manual in the first weeks of school, the JMIS staff asked teachers to complete a questionnaire indicating the degree to which they had read and studied each of the nine chapters of the manual and whether the contents were helpful to them. A copy of this questionnaire is provided in Appendix C. Teachers in the experimental group were asked not to share the contents of the manual or workshops with other teachers or school personnel for the duration of the study.

Description of control procedures. The teachers in the control group did not receive the management manual or the workshops during the study. They were informed of the purpose of the study when they were

contacted by telephone to solicit their participation. At that time they were told that they would receive manuals and would be invited to participate in a workshop at the end of data collection. Workshops were held for the control group teachers in both districts during March, after all observations were completed. Because these workshops occurred after data collection and had no bearing on tests of hypotheses, no further description will be provided.

Data Collection

Observer training. Classroom observations in the JMIS were made by 20 trained observers, including six staff members of RCLT and 14 temporary or part-time employees. Of the 20 observers, 10 had graduate degrees in education, eight were currently graduate students in education, and three had graduate degrees or were graduate students in fields related to education. Fifteen of the observers had classroom teaching experience in elementary or secondary schools. Because District A and District B were in different cities, two teams of observers were used. Training procedures were the same at both sites, and training at Site B was supervised by project personnel who had been trainers for the District A observers. Observer training took place during the week prior to the beginning of data collection, and included 2 1/2 days of in-class training and additional out-of-class assignments. Observers received explanations of the background and purpose of the study, as well as guidelines and directions for using the observation instruments. Training activities included reliability checks, practice with videotapes of classroom instruction, and other types of practice exercises.

Classroom observation schedules. In order to assess the treatment impact on treatment teachers and their classes, each teacher was

observed in two classes beginning in August and extending through February, with emphasis given to the first 8 weeks of school. The choice of which two of each teacher's classes to observe was dependent on the need to use observer time efficiently and to avoid very unusual classes. Thus, class sections that were unusual (e.g., research or honor science rather than regular science classes, or algebra rather than general eighth grade mathematics, or team-taught classes) were not included in the study. In District A each teacher was observed on the first class day and on two or three other occasions during the first week in one class. In District B each teacher was also observed on the first day of school and one or two more times that week (District B's first school day was a Wednesday). In both districts each teacher was observed once per week in each of two classes during Weeks 2 through 8. Therefore, each teacher in the study was observed between 16 to 18 times during the first 8 weeks of school. From January through February, each teacher was observed four more times in both classes. Each observation lasted the full period. Observers were assigned to teachers so that at least two observers saw each teacher on several occasions durings Weeks 1-8 and during January-February. Observers were not informed about group assignments of the teachers. To further minimize observer bias, observers were told in training not to guess the group to which a particular teacher might be assigned, and they were not provided access to the management manuals or workshop materials.

Observation Instruments

Narrative records. Narrative records were used to gather qualitative data about classroom activities and behaviors of both teachers and students. During each observation an observer wrote a description of

classroom events on the narrative record form. The observer was asked to preserve the sequence of activities, noting teacher and student behaviors and recording as many direct quotes as possible. The length of the narrative record varied, depending upon the complexity of the classroom setting, behaviors, and activities, as well as the skill of the observer in recording details of classroom life. Manuscripts for an observation in the study typically ranged between six and nine pages. Training procedures emphasized gathering information about dimensions relevant to management variables while still allowing observers to note and record other details of classroom life. Written instructions provided to the observer during training are shown in Appendix D. A portion of a sample narrative is also provided for readers interested in the nature of the descriptive data gathered using this technique.

Student Engagement Rates (SER). On task rates and the amount of unsanctioned, off task student behavior, two important dependent variables in the study, were assessed using this instrument. Beginning at a randomly determined time during the first 10 minutes of each observation, and thereafter every 10 minutes, observers stopped taking notes for the Narrative Record and used the SER form to record the number of students in the class who were engaged in academic or procedural activities or who were off task, in dead time, or unobservable. Observers recorded approximately five assessments on the form during each observation. Appendix E contains the training manual along with a sample form. SER counts were converted to proportions by dividing the number of students in each category by the number of observable students present. A score for each category in each observation was obtained by calculating the average of the SERs during that observation. Each time

an SER was completed, the observer also recorded the type of activity and the lesson format so that later analysis of these data by format or activity type is feasible.

Two reliability checks were made. During training, observers used the SER to assess engagement for several videotape lesson segments. Their assessments were compared to experts' (experienced staff) assessments, and good levels of agreement were obtained. Another check on reliability was provided in 28 paired observations, in which a staff member accompanied an observer and both recorded SERs during a live observation. This was done on 28 occasions. Intraclass correlations were calculated to estimate the percent of variance of each variable that was reliable. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4. As can be seen from this table, most variables on this form were reliable at satisfactory levels.

Observer Ratings of Teachers (ORT). At the end of the first 8 weeks of observations, a set of summary ratings of each teacher was made by observers who had seen the teacher on at least three occasions. In addition, at the end of the January-February observations, observers who had seen a teacher at least three times during that period also provided a set of summary ratings. The purpose of the ratings was to gather information about teaching behavior and activities that might require several observations to assess, or that were expected to occur relatively less frequently than most variables assessed on the Component Ratings. The observer rating form is shown in Appendix G. The reliablity of the observer summary ratings was determined by comparing the ratings made by different observers of the same teachers. These reliabilities are given in Table 5. As can be seen from Table 5, about

3/4 of the ORT variables achieved significant observer agreement ($p < .05$). Only these variables were retained for further analyses.

Component Ratings (CR) and Addendum Component Ratings (AdCR). After each observation the Component Rating scales were used by the observer to assess teacher and student behavior in a number of variables. The seven Addendum Component Rating scales were used only during the first week of school. The scales are defined in a coder's manual in Appendix F. Student behaviors assessed with the Component Ratings include the level of disruptive behavior, inappropriate behavior, and task-oriented behavior, variables used as dependent measures (in addition to on task and off task rates) to assess treatment effects on student behavior. In addition, a variety of teacher behaviors are measured, many of which relate directly to one or more of the classroom management recommendations provided to the treatment teachers. Thus, comparisons of the Component Ratings for treatment and control teachers provide tests of implementation of the treatment recommendations.

Estimates of reliability of the Component Rating variables are given in Table 6. These estimates are derived from observations in Weeks 2 through 8. Because each teacher was seen by two or more observers, an estimate of agreement between observers can be obtained by comparing the observers' ratings. Each observer's Component Rating scores were averaged across the observations made of the teacher. These observer averages were compared using intraclass correlations for each variable. It is important to note that these coefficients represent both the reliablity of observers as well as stability over time so that these coefficients are an estimate of the generalizability of the

variables. The data indicate that most of the CR variables are reliable. Those that did not exhibit significant reliablity were not used in tests of hypotheses of treatment-control differences, nor in other data analyses reported in the results section of this report.

Narrative Reader Ratings (NRR). A narrative assessment form was developed for use by readers of the narratives in order to provide quantitative summaries of relevant management variables. The assessment form also helped to document the information available in the qualitative data base provided by the narratives. Items were chosen for inclusion in the narrative assessment form either because they represented variables of interest in comparing the experimental and control groups in the study or because they represented important dimensions of classroom management not adequately assessed using the other instruments. Such variables included those which require multiple observations in order to render a satisfactory judgement, or which are categorical in nature and require the classification of the teacher as possessing particular management characteristics. For the present report and associated analyses, narratives were read for a given teacher during Weeks 1-8. Readers were assigned to read all of the narratives for a given teacher beginning with the first day of class and extending through the eighth week of school for the class in which the teacher was observed on the first day. Each teacher's narrative set was read by two readers out of a pool of eight readers. Reader reliability was checked by calculating intraclass correlations of ratings made by pairs of readers assigned the same set of narratives. The reliability of the various NRR variables are shown in Table 7. The narrative assessment form itself is also given in Appendix H. As can be seen from the table,

all of the variables on this form achieved significant ($p < .05$) reliability, although the actual reliability (e.g., percent of total variance accounted for by between-teacher differences) was less than .5 on a number of the variables.

Other Data

Several other types of data were collected in the JMIS. These data were intended for use in understanding the teachers' perception of the treatments and other aspects of the study and to obtain information about the classroom context in which each teacher taught.

Management manual questionnaire. All experimental group teachers completed a questionnaire assessing the reactions to each section of the management manual. The questionnaire is shown in Appendix C. The teacher's perception of usefulness of each section of the manual was assessed by 11 questions, scaled from 1 (not useful) to 5 (very useful). The degree to which the teacher reported reading and studying each section was assessed by 11 additional items, scaled from 1 (none) to 5 (studied this part carefully). Teachers in the experimental group were mailed the questionnaire prior to the second workshop and were asked to bring the completed form to the workshop. In addition, the questionnaires were mailed to these teachers prior to their interview in March; the questionnaires were collected at the interview meeting. The control teachers, of course, were not asked to complete this form, as they had not had access to the manual.

Teacher interviews. After all observations in classrooms were completed and all workshops had been conducted, each teacher was interviewed in March or early April. The purpose of the interview was to gather information about the impact of the study on the teacher, the

perceptions of the teacher regarding management issues in general, their reactions to events during the year, and their perceptions and reports of their experiences during the year in the area of classroom management. The length of the interviews varied but most were approximately one hour. The interviews were tape recorded and subsequently transcribed. Copies of the interview questions are provided in the Appendix I.

Results

This section will present the results of the data analyses for the two major hypotheses and the three Research Questions described in the statement of the problem.

Treatment Implementation

Hypothesis 1. Teachers who are provided at the beginning of the school year with a manual and workshops describing effective management behaviors will subsequently exhibit more such behaviors than will teachers not receiving the manual and workshops.

Classroom observation data from the first 8 weeks. Teacher behavior measures were available from four instruments: Component Ratings (CRs), Addendum Component Ratings (AdCRs), Observer Ratings of Teachers (ORTs), and Narrative Reader Ratings (NRRs). Only the subset of variables that reflected the experimental treatment recommendations was used for the test of this hypothesis. Selected variables from each instrument were grouped into one of the nine management areas (cf. Table 8). The variable means and associated probability levels for the significance test of the difference between means (ANOVA) on each of these variables are presented in Table 8. (Results for all the variables including those not identified as indicators of treatment implementation are presented in Appendix J.) Analyses in Table 8 are

for the 38 teachers who had 0 to 2 years of teaching experience. Data for the 10 Experienced-management problem teachers will be presented later in the results for Research Question 1. Separate results are not presented for school districts or for 0, 1, or 2 years of teaching experience because preliminary analyses did not identify significant group by district or group by experience effects on more variables then would be expected by chance alone. Slightly more than chance numbers of significant main effects were detected for district and experience level (0 years had lower scores on management implementation), but the effects were not very large and did not affect as many variables as the treatment. Consequently, the results in Table 8 are limited to treatment and control group differences. All the significance tests in Table 8 are based on a one way analysis of variance, with one and 36 degrees of freedom for the F ratio and a nondirectional alternate hypotheses (i.e., $M_E \neq M_C$). The results, presented by management area, are summarized briefly below.

1. Room arrangement. None of the three indicator variables in this area was significant although one test approached significance ($p = .07$). Thus no evidence exists for implementation in this area.

2. Rules and procedures. Of the 17 variables in this area, 11 were significant ($p < .05$) and two others approached significance. Treatment group managers had more appropriate and efficient classroom procedures and fewer problems with students in areas such as speaking without permission, being out of seat, talking during class activities, and other classroom conduct areas.

3. Procedures for student accountability. Of the 11 indicator variables in this area, seven produced significant differences favoring

the experimental group, with three other variables approaching significance. Experimental group teachers monitored student progress more closely, enforced work standards more consistently, and had better routines for communicating assignments to students.

4. Consequences. Experimental group teachers had more effective consequence systems, were more consistent in their use of penalties, and rewarded appropriate behavior more than control group teachers. Tests of the six indicator variables in this area showed three significant differences and two others approaching significance.

5. Activities for the first week. Experimental group teachers taught the rules and procedures more effectively and provided more review and feedback to students in this area. Of the nine tests of group differences, two were significant and two others approached significance.

6. Maintaining skills. Experimental group teachers were better at monitoring student behavior, were more consistent in their management behaviors, and stopped inappropriate student behavior more quickly. There were less likely to ignore misbehavior and more apt to cite their rules and procedures when dealing with inappropriate behavior. Eight of the nine indicator variables in this area showed significant differences favoring the experimental group.

7. Instructional clarity. Experimental teachers were rated as being more likely to wait for student attention before giving instructions and to monitor student understanding during presentations. Of the seven variables in this area, two showed significant differences between the experimental and control groups.

8. Organizing instruction. Experimental group teachers conducted more efficient transitions, were more likely to have enough work for students, and had fewer problems associated with running out of things for students to do. Of 10 significance tests of variables, six showed differences in favor of the experimental group and one other difference approached significance.

9. Adjusting instruction for special groups. No treatment impact could be identified in this area. Of the three indicator variables none were significant and only one approached significance.

Other evidence for implementation. Additional information on implementation of the management recommendations was obtained from the teacher's responses to the manual questionnaire and to selected interview questions. The manual questionnaire asked teachers to respond to two questions about each of the nine manual sections: "How useful did you find the suggestions in this section," and "How much did you read or study the contents of this section?" Means from the September and March administrations of this instrument are shown in Table 13 (see Appendix C for questionnaire items and associated scales). Using data from the core subject teachers only, teachers reported having read and studied the first six sections of the manual more than the last three. In these six areas, none of the means was below three and most were closer to four, indicating that teachers had at least read and some had studied extensively the sections in question. The means were higher in March than in September in all areas, which would be expected given the constraints on time at the beginning of the year. When the teachers were asked to rate the usefulness of each section of the manual, most indicated that each section was at least moderately useful. In the

March administration of the questionnaire, three areas (rules and procedures, activities for the first week, and maintaining skills) received average ratings above four, indicating that these sections were viewed as "useful and helpful, and teachers said they used many of the suggestions."

Several interview questions attempted to assess the impact of the treatment on experimental teachers. Experimental group teachers gave more positive responses to an interview question that asked them whether they had made changes in their behavior, activities, or procedures this year [M(Exp) = 3.29, M (Cont) = 2.53, t = 2.17, $p < .05$]. A scale score of 3 reflected moderate change; a scale score of 2 reflected little change. The experimental group teachers attributed the changes they had made to their participation in the study. Responses to the question, "To what extent are these changes the result of participation in the study," were higher for the experimental group [M(Exp) = 3.08, M(Cont) = 1.23, t = 5.27, $p < .001$]. A scale score of 3 indicated the study was a moderate cause of change; a scale score of 1 indicated that participation was not a factor in any changes made. When compared to the control group teachers, the experimental teachers tended to perceive improved student behavior in their classes during this study, with more positive responses to the question, "Are your classes running better or worse this year compared to last year--or if the teacher was in his or her first year, compared to what you expected." [M(Exp) = 6.40, M(Cont) = 5.56, t = 2.33, $p < .05$]. A scale score of 5 reflected a response of "slightly better", a scale score of 6 reflected a response of "better", and a scale score of 7 reflected a response of "much better". As was the case with their attribution for the reasons for

their own behavior change, the experimental teachers also tended to ascribe their classes' improved behavior to participation in the study [M(Exp) = 2.57, M(Cont) = 1.19, t = 4.81, $p < .001$]. A scale score of 3 reflected an attribution that participation was a "moderate" cause of class behavior improvement; a scale score of 2 reflected "slight cause", a scale score of 1 indicated that participation was not a factor.

A differential effect of the observer's presence was noted by teachers, with the experimental group teachers reporting more change as a result of being observed [M(Exp) = 2.26, M(Cont) = 1.75, t = 2.24, $p < .05$]. A scale score of 2 indicated that the teacher perceived "a slight effect" of the observer on teachers or students; a 1 reflected a perception of no effect of being observed. When the interviews were examined to determine the nature of the observer effect for those teachers reporting an effect, a wide range of comments was obtained. Many teachers reported feeling nervous initially with the effect of being observed occurring only for them and not their students. Of those teachers who reported some effect of observation on their students, approximately equal numbers reported that students seemed to be better behaved during the observations while others indicated that students tended to misbehave or "show off" more when the observer was present. A few teachers reported being more alert or "up". One teacher reported being unable to implement the manual recommendations as well when an observer was present than when the observer was not in the room. Many of the teachers noted that the effect of an observer was limited mainly to the first few observations and that after they and their students became accustomed to the observer's presence, no impact was evident. A few teachers mentioned that the effect was limited to curiosity on the

part of students. One experimental teacher indicated a substantial effect for an observer, but her comments indicated that this was limited to making her feel very tense and uncomfortable.

Thus the data from the manual questionnaire and the interview are consistent with the data from the classroom observations during Weeks 1 through 8 and supports the inference that treatment teachers tended to use management recommendations presented as part of the experimental treatment and that these attempts were translated into their classroom management behaviors.

Effects on Student Behavior

> Hypothesis 2. Teachers provided with the manual and workshops at the beginning of the school year will establish and maintain better managed classes than will teachers not receiving the manual and workshops.

Hypothesis 2 was tested using several student behavior variables as indicators of management effectiveness. Three of these variables were taken from the Component Ratings: disruptive behavior, inappropriate behavior, and task orientation. Two other variables were obtained from the SER instrument and are based on frequency counts of students on and off task: proportion of students who were off task unsanctioned and proportion of students who were on task during each observation. In order to check for differential change across time periods, these data were aggregated separately for observations in Week 1, Weeks 2 through 4, and Weeks 4 through 8 (approximately equal numbers of observations in time periods). Data were analyzed using a group-by-time-periods repeated measures ANOVA. Means and significance levels for each variable are shown in Table 9. Group effects favoring the experimental group were found for the off task and on task variables and for the task

orientation assessment. The significance test for inappropriate behavior approached significance ($p = .06$), while the means for disruptive behavior, although favoring the experimental groups, were not significantly different. Some effects for time periods were noted; however, no interactions between group and time were significant, indicating no diminution (or increase) in treatment impact. The absence of effect for the disruptive behavior variable might be attributable to the relatively low occurrence of disruption in most classes in the sample.

Treatment Effects in January-February

Implementation in January-February. As described in the sample subsection of the methods, attrition of four teachers occurred in the experimental group and five teachers in the control group. When the reduced experimental and control group samples were compared using management indicator variables from the various instruments, few significant differences were found. The differences between the groups favored the experimental condition in most cases, but not at statistically significant ($p < .05$) levels. When the experimental and control groups (reduced samples) were compared on the five management indicator variables for the January-February observations, results were similar to those for the treatment implementation: Differences tended to favor the treatment condition but not at statistically significant levels.

Sample attrition effects. In order to determine what effect attrition had on experimental and control group composition, an analysis using data from Weeks 1 through 8 was done comparing the five control group teachers who were lost to the study for the January-February observations (C-LOST) with the remaining 15 control group teachers, (C-REM). Another analysis compared the four experimental group teachers

who left the study (E-LOST) to the 14 who remain (E-REM). The results indicated that attrition differentially affected the composition of the two groups. Using t-tests of differences between means of the implementation variables, the five teachers in the C-LOST group were lower than the 15 teachers in the C-REM group. In spite of the small sample size, significant ($p < .05$) effects were observed on many of these variables. On the management outcome variables, similar differences were noted:

On task proportion:

$\bar{X}$(C-REM) = .86, $\bar{X}$(C-LOST) = .81, ($p = .06$)

Disruptive behavior:

$\bar{X}$(C-REM) = 1.43, $\bar{X}$(C-LOST) = 2.02, ($p = .03$)

Inappropriate behavior:

$\bar{X}$(C-REM) = 2.46, $\bar{X}$(C-LOST) = 3.22, ($p = .07$)

When the four teachers in the experimental group who were lost to the study were compared to the 14 teachers who remained, most mean differences favored the E-LOST group. However, few were statistically significant. On the management outcome variables, differences approached significance on one variable, again favoring the E-LOST group:

Disruptive behavior:

$\bar{X}$(E-REM) = 1.36, $\bar{X}$(E-LOST) = 1.21, ($p = .33$)

Inappropriate behavior:

$\bar{X}$(E-REM) = 2.29, $\bar{X}$(E-LOST) = 1.68, ($p = .07$)

On task proportion:

$\bar{X}$(E-REM) = .91, $\bar{X}$(E-LOST) = .89, ($p = .58$)

Thus, although there was substantial evidence that the teachers lost from the control group were mainly poor managers, no such evidence

exists for teachers in the experimental group. If anything, the teachers who were lost to the experimental group were on the average slightly better managers. Thus, the absence of treatment effects in the January-February data may be due to the differential attrition of teachers from the groups.

A Check for Halo

Differences between the experimental and the control groups rely on data obtained from observers who could be potentially influenced by their overall impressions of teachers. Should such bias be present in the data, then inferences about treatment effects could also be biased, although observers did not know group assignments of teachers. For example, if an observer formed a positive impression of an experimental group teacher because of higher rates of on task behavior, then that observer might be more likely to assess other aspects of the teacher's behavior favorably. This bias could cause the teacher to receive higher implementation scores in particular management areas when in fact no implementation occurred. A check for such bias was made by selecting seven teacher behavior variables (prior to an examination of the data) that were not directly related to the treatment but are potentially susceptible to observer halo effects. These variables were chosen because they are easily associated with assumed good or bad teacher traits (e.g., Teacher was warm and pleasant, Class has a relaxed, pleasant atmosphere, Teacher used criticism). Using data from the first 8 weeks, one way ANOVAs of experimental vs. control group means were computed. Results are presented in Table 10. No significant differences were obtained, nor did any result approach significance.

Thus no evidence was found that suggests the experimental-control group differences are the result of observer halo.

Other Results

In addition to the results for the major hypotheses, data collected in the JMIS also address other research questions of interest.

> Research Question 1: Are the management training materials and workshops effective for the teachers who are relatively experienced but who have had problems in the area of classroom management?

To address this question, t-test comparisons were made between experimental group teachers ($n = 6$) and control group teachers ($n = 4$) who were in the subsample of Experience-management problem teachers. Means and associated probability levels for a t-test of each difference are shown in Table 11. Generally, no significant effects are noted. One exception may be in the First Week Activities area, which had one significant difference ($p < .05$) and two differences approaching significance ($p < .10$) out of nine variables. Of course, the small sample size used to test the hypothesis makes these significance tests very low in power. Consequently, the differences between experimental and control groups for the Experienced-management problem teachers were compared to the differences obtained in the main sample. Table 12 shows these differences for both samples and also lists the associated probability levels for each significance test. Variables in this table are grouped by instrument, and only those variables for which significant differences were obtained in the main sample are included. A comparison of the differences obtained for the Experienced-management problem sample and the main sample indicates that on most variables there are smaller effects for the former. Thus no evidence was obtained for an overall treatment effect for this special group of teachers.

Research Question 2: Will the teacher behavior and activities associated with effective management in earlier research, particularly in the Junior High Classroom Organization Study (JHCOS) also be associated with effective management in the present study?

Using data from the first 8 weeks, each teacher and student behavior variable was aggregated across observations for each observed class. Table 14 shows the intercorrelations among five student behavior variables indicative of good classroom management. Data are based on 76 classrooms of 38 teachers in the main sample. Because of the high intercorrelations, only two variables were retained for further analysis: On task proportion and Disruptive behavior. These two variables were correlated -.62, indicating a moderate degree of interdependence. The other three student variables were highly correlated with one or both of the two variables retained for further analysis.

Correlations were then computed between each of the teacher behaviors related to treatment recommendations and the two student behavior variables. These correlations are shown in Table 15. It should be noted that the correlations in Tables 14 and 15 are partial correlations, with group membership (experimental versus control) coded as a dummy variable and partialed out of the indicated correlations. This was done because earlier analyses had revealed significant group differences on many of the variables. In each of the nine management areas, significant correlations were found between management behavior variables and one or both of the student behavior criteria, but fewer relationships were found for some areas of management than others. Of a total of 75 variables that were used to measure implementation of recommended management practices, 54 were significantly related ($p \leq .05$) to one or both student behavior criteria. With regard to

strongest individual predictors, some differences were found for management relationships with the two different student behavior criteria. However, patterns of significant relationships for the two criteria were not different. Management areas with either relatively few or with low levels ($r < .60$) of correlation with both of the management criteria included organizing the room and materials, consequences, planning activities for the first week, and adjusting instruction for special groups. Management areas demonstrating the strongest teacher behavior--teacher behavior relationships included Developing workable rules and procedures, Student accountability, Maintaining the management system, Clarity, and Organizing instruction.

> Research Question 3: How are management outcomes affected by the contextual features of classrooms such as (a) subject area, (b) composition of the class, including ethnic and sex proportions, and (c) student entering ability?

Subject area effects were tested by ANOVAs comparing student behavior means for the subgroups of science, social studies, math, and English teachers. No significant effects were found for any of the five student behavior variables: on and off task rates, disruptive, inappropriate, and task-oriented behavior.

Examination of other contextual variables was done by computing correlations between the context variables and five student behavior variables used as indicators of management effectiveness. The context variables included (a) number of students enrolled in each class, (b) the proportion of female students in a class, (c) the proportion of class enrollment in each major ethnic group, and (d) entering class academic ability levels. Information about entering ability levels of classes in District A (only) were available in the form of students'

test scores from the preceding year. Class mean percentile scores on the mathematics and reading subtests of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills were available for two classes each of 13 experimental group and 13 control group teachers. Effects of these four classroom contexts on class composition variables were tested by a series of multiple regression equations, with each student behavior variable used as a criterion and the context variables used as predictors. In all analyses, the effects of group membership were partialled out. Means and standard deviations of the context variables are presented in Table 16. Correlations between context variables and management outcomes are presented in Table 17. The only significant ($p < .05$) correlations are between percent female students and on task proportion ($r = .25$) and entering academic ability and task oriented behavior ($r = .29$). Ethnic composition was not related to the management indices. It should be noted that the range of the variable, Proportion of Blacks was somewhat restricted, with 58% being the largest number of Black students observed. Subject matter effects were also absent, with no significant differences on any of the five management outcomes across the subject areas. Thus, context factors were only weakly related, at best, to management outcomes in this study.

Discussion

Implementation

The comparisons of the experimental and control groups on measures of treatment implementation and management outcomes during Weeks 1 through 8 indicated that the treatment recommendations were used by the experimental group teachers to a greater degree than by control group teachers, and resulted in improved classroom management in the experi-

mental teachers' classes. The comparisons of the two groups by management areas indicated that some recommendations were used more than other areas, with certain areas not showing evidence of implementation.

1. Organizing the room and materials. Recommendations in this area dealt with the preparation of wall and bulletin boards, the organization of supplies and materials, and the arrangement of desks and other furniture to facilitate instruction and traffic flow. No evidence of differences between experimental and control groups was found. However, both groups had high averages on the indicators in this area. Thus for the most part the teachers were already able to deal effectively with components in this area.

2. Rules and procedures. Teachers were provided with a description of areas of behavior in which clear expectations should be established. These included general conduct as well as procedures for specific activities. Topics covered included beginning- and ending-class routines, teacher-student contacts, student movement, and student talk. The results indicated that these recommendations were widely implemented although a few variables reflecting low incidence behaviors were not significantly different. Experimental teachers generally had more efficient administrative routines and general procedures, and had fewer problems with call outs, out of seat students, ending-class procedures, or inappropriate student talk.

3. Student accountability. Recommendations in this area were centered on developing procedures to help students be more responsible for their work. The procedures encompassed work requirements, assignments and directions, monitoring student work, checking, and feedback. Significant differences between groups on most indicators in this area

showed widespread implementation; however, the control group teachers were consistently above a scale value of 3, indicating at least moderate levels of competence in this area. Also, the average difference between the groups was usually around 1/2 of a scale point; thus, the treatment appears to have improved skills in an area that was already fairly well developed.

4. Consequences. Deciding on consequences, including both rewards and penalties, relating them to major rules and procedures, and using the consequences consistently were the major themes of this area of the manual. Implementation data indicated that experimental teachers used more rewards and that they were more consistent in using negative consequences than were control teachers. However, the levels of implementation were not high and several indicator variables showed no difference or only marginally significant differences. Narrative data indicate that in many classes, reward and penalty systems were present but were not a major factor in the day to day operation. Instead, such systems tended to be used for less common behavior or periodic events (e.g., tardiness), rather than throughout a class period. Furthermore, rewards and penalties associated with academic work are not evident for the most part to observers, who did not have access to feedback on tests, papers, report cards, and the like.

5. Activities for the first week. Recommendations in this area were to teach students desired behavior by presenting a set of rules and by teaching students the classroom procedures and consequences developed as part of Areas 2, 3, and 4. Experimental group teachers were assessed as having taught rules and procedures better than control teachers, and they provided more review and feedback. The groups were not different

on several first week variables (e.g., Stays in charge of all students, Materials are ready) on which both groups were assessed at high levels. On a few areas showing no difference (e.g., Rationale for rules and procedures explained, Presentation of rules and procedures includes rehearsal and practice, Teacher conveys value of curriculum), moderate or low levels of behavior were observed. These may be areas that are not very compatible with the contraints imposed by the grade/age levels of students, or they may not have been adequately explained in the treatment materials.

6. Maintaining skills. Recommendations in this area dealt with the need for careful monitoring of student behavior, prompt handling of inappropriate behavior (unless it was minor, unobtrusive, and not likely to persist), and consistency in the use of consequences. Results indicated that experimental teachers followed these recommendations to a significantly greater degree than control teachers. The only indicator not showing implementation differences was the use of rules and procedures to deal with disruptive behavior.

7. Instructional clarity. Recommendations in this area were to plan lessons with coherent sequences, to anticipate student difficulties, to check frequently on student comprehension during instruction, and to use clear, precise language. Experimental teachers were assessed higher on Monitoring student understanding and Waiting for attention, but not on other variables, including general ratings of clarity. The evidence on implementation in this area is equivocal because it could be attributed to the influence of other areas; i.e., Monitoring may be a function of the recommendations in the "Maintaining" chapter, and Waits for attention could be a function of Chapter 2's recommendations on

procedures for student conduct during presentations. Because the teachers generally rated their use of this section of the manual lower than the first six areas and because so few of them mentioned it in their interviews as a reason for their behavior change, the authors are inclined to view this area as one of minimal implementation.

8. Organizing instruction. Recommended behaviors included obtaining frequent assessments of student comprehension during instruction, planning seatwork activities that were not excessively long, having enough work for students, and using efficient transitions and careful pacing. Results of the comparisons provided evidence that experimental teachers were able to use recommended strategies for efficient transitions and for planning sufficient lessons with appropriate amounts of work. These recommendations were stated in very specific terms with numerous concrete examples and were relatively easy to comprehend and implement. Implementation was not observed in Pacing, Overly long lesson activities, or Readiness of materials. Of these latter unimplemented recommendations, the material for pacing was not very specific and the other two were observed at high levels in the control group.

9. Adjusting instruction for special groups. The last section of the manual was addressed to problems of teaching low ability students or highly heterogeneous classes. No evidence of differences between experimental and control groups was obtained. This lack of implementation may have been due to a variety of factors. First, the recommended strategies may not have been realistic enough or they may have required more time and effort than teachers were able to bring to the task. Also, this material was placed last in the manual, so that it may have been overlooked or given less emphasis by the teachers. This is

supported by the relatively low assessments that the chapter received on "usefulness" or on the "read and studied" items on the Manual Questionnaire. Finally, the content of the chapter was targeted to special classes. Most of those in the study were not low ability classes, so teachers may have felt little motivation to deal with the content in the part of the chapter on teaching lower ability groups. There was a sizable number of heterogeneous classes in the sample, but the teachers may not have perceived them as such or, if they did so, they may simply not have been willing or able to make the recommended adjustments in their instruction. Because the problem of managing highly heterogeneous groups is a very complex one for which secondary teachers are often not provided much training to begin with, the manual's recommendations may not have been sufficiently specific or detailed to make a difference, particularly for those teachers not highly atuned to the existence of the problem.

Implementation Evidence from the Interviews

When the interviews were examined to identify areas of implementation reported by teachers, along with aspects of the treatment that may have made a difference to them, a number of features were noted that either supported or supplemented the classroom observation data.

Teachers were asked several questions during the March interview to determine whether their participation had made a difference in the way they conducted classes. Interviews were available for 16 of the 18 experimental group teachers in the main sample. Fourteen of the 16 teachers indicated making some change as a result of their participation in the study. Because these reported changes are pertinent to the question of whether implementation of treatment recommendations varied

by management area, teacher responses were coded by management area. Numbers of teachers citing a change in each area are indicated in parentheses: Rules and Procedures (8), Organizing Instruction (4), Maintaining Skills (3), Accountability Procedures (2), Consequences (1), First Week Activities (1), and Instructional Clarity (1). The areas of Organizing and Arranging the Room and Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups were not cited by any teacher. Several responses could not be classified as falling within one of the management areas: Two teachers reported simply using the manual or manual guidelines without specifying particular areas of change, and three teachers mentioned feeling more confident as a result of the information they received in the study. The self-reported changes parallel the observation data on implementation in several aspects. The changes cited most frequently by teachers were in areas that the classroom observation data had also indicated implementation had occurred. Also, the two areas with no implementation evidence from the observation data (Room Arrangement and Adjusting Instruction) were not cited by any teachers as having been changed. These results are also similar, though not identical to, the results obtained with the Manual Questionnaire. On that instrument, teachers had indicated highest utility for Rules and Procedures, Activities for the First Week, and Maintaining Skills, and lowest assessments for Instructional Clarity and Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups. The prominence given to first week activities in the Manual Questionnaire but not in the teachers' self-report responses of change is not necessarily inconsistent. Much of the material in the first week activities area involves implementation of rules and procedures and other areas of teacher planning. Although the actual behavior indicators of implemen-

tation were not as strong for the area of first week activities as for several other areas, the teachers' perception of the usefulness of this area may been a function of its overlap with the highly implemented area of rules and procedures.

Factors Affecting Implementation

The success of the treatment implementation and the improvement in student behavior appears to be the result of several factors. The treatment focused on content which addressed a high concern level for most of the teachers in the main sample, and most areas of the treatment manual were perceived as appropriate and containing useful recommendations. In spite of the short period of time for studying the materials prior to the beginning of classes and other factors competing for the teachers' attention during this time, the evidence from the questionnaire and the interview data indicates that most of the teachers did read much of the material. Furthermore, the treatment recommendations were not viewed as highly novel or as requiring unusual behavior or effort on the teachers' part. In fact, many teachers reported that they had encountered most of the ideas before but that they were helped by the material being organized and presented in a manner they could use in their classes. Finally, the teachers themselves reported they used treatment recommendations in their teaching, that student behavior was improved, and that this improvement was due in large part to their participation in the study. These perceptions no doubt encouraged teachers to make continued use of the recommendations and to be successful in their efforts to achieve good class management.

Limitations

The experimental treatment in the study was mainly informational, with no opportunity for feedback, directed practice, diagnosis with targeted intervention, or continued support and encouragement from staff or colleagues. Thus the treatment conforms to the type noted in the literature review as a minimal intervention, as was the case for several other successful studies using the same paradigm of basing a field experiment on prior process-product research on teaching. This study, as did the others, offered teachers a variety of recommendations and allowed them to use or to adapt whichever they wished. Such an approach produces a multi-faceted treatment and an inability to specify with certainty which treatment components contributed to the better management observed in the classrooms of experimental group teachers. It seems reasonable that various aspects of the treatment recommendations were important for different teachers, as the teachers themselves suggested in their interviews. While this type of intervention appears effective when it is directed at an area of high teacher concern and when a broad base of information and suggestions are available to offer teachers, other approaches, such as a diagnostic-prescriptive treatment, might be more suited for other types of teachers or objectives. Furthermore, other approaches might be necessary to sustain a treatment impact produced by a mainly informational program.

A major limitation of the results for the main sample was the inability to verify a long term effect, due to the differential attrition from the experimental and control groups. However, even granting that the experimental group losses were of relatively good managers and that the control group losses were from the poor managers in that group,

the fact is that the treatment effects were not evident after a loss of 25% of the sample. Consequently, we cannot argue that the treatment produced a broad, pervasive and lasting impact on most of the experimental teachers. Although no pre-experiment observations were possible given that the treatment that was intended for the beginning of the year, extrapolation from the control group data indicates the likelihood that the experimental group had a number of teachers who were already good managers when the study began. Thus, it seems unlikely that this treatment could have had a pronounced effect on them. In addition, there were undoubtedly a few experimental group teachers who were unable to take advantage of the information offered to them. Thus, the likelihood is that the treatment had a slight impact on some of the teachers, a moderate effect on others, and a strong impact on a few teachers.

The Experienced-Management Problem Teachers

The results for the experimental and control group comparisons for the More Experienced--Management problems subsample gives no evidence for an effect on the management outcomes and only a slight effect on the teachers' behaviors. Although these teachers generally endorsed the management recommendations as strongly as did teachers in the main sample, the only evidence for impact was in the "first week" area. The degree of change reported by the six experimental group teachers was substantially lower than the main group teachers, and, in contrast to the main group teachers' perception that student behavior was improved, the more experienced teachers saw no improvement in their classes. Thus, it is likely that in those areas in which teachers attempted some change during the first part of the year, it was insufficient to produce an effect on students, and the absence of student behavior change gave no support to further attempts to make changes.

One reason for the absence of treatment effects may be, of course, that the multi-faceted informational approach is not an appropriate one for this population of teachers. The fact that the teachers endorsed the treatment recommendations but were less likely to use them suggests strongly that this population of teachers may need more motivation for change or may need more direction in the ways that they might try to change. A more personalized, individualized approach might be successful in providing the support and encouragement these teachers need to alter behavior patterns that they have been practicing for years, and to sustain new behaviors in the face of limited initial success. However, some cautions must be exercised before accepting this interpretation. First, the sample size was very small, so that the power of statistical tests to detect large, let alone moderate or slight, differences between the groups was weak. Second, the defining characteristics of this population of teachers is not sufficiently clear, and the teachers in our subsamples were far from a homogeneous group of "poor managers". In fact, several of the teachers in both the experimental and control groups were quite capable managers who gave little evidence of major problems. Thus, our requests to principals to nominate experienced teachers who had problems in classroom management were not adequate, and either better specificity in these instructions, or observations during the preceding year might have been a more appropriate procedure for selecting this subsample. For those teachers who had management problems, it is also possible that their problems did not stem from a lack of classroom management knowledge or technique but from other deficits not addressed by the treatment. In particular, the interviews of some teachers suggest an acceptance of their situation as at least

tolerable, and in fact these teachers' classes, while not optimal learning environments, were not out of control. Thus, to a degree, these teachers' inertia may be viewed as a coping response: Confronted by management problems that were not so severe as to put their ability to teach in jeopardy but which were relatively intractable, they lowered their expectations and accepted the situation.

Management Practices

In addressing Research Question 2, the authors examined relationships between specific management practices and two student behavior criteria: student engagement rates (on task proportions) and rates of disruptive student behavior. In general, most of the management practices that were part of the treatment recommendations in this study were supported by significant correlations with one or both of the management effectiveness criteria, and no strong patterns of different relationships were found for the two different criteria. In discussing these results, the authors will present some conclusions about what management skills appeared to be most important at the junior high level, comment on management areas that were poorly supported by correlations with student behavior, compare the junior high findings with findings from a similar study in elementary schools, and, finally, consider implications of the correlational results in light of the treatment effects obtained in this study.

Teacher behaviors in nine areas of classroom management were examined in this study. Each area was included because earlier research in classroom management suggested its potential importance for management at the junior high grade level; however, a few areas that were included had not been examined in any detail in junior high

studies or had been weakly supported. For example, variables relating to organization of classroom space and materials had not been reported to differentiate more and less effective teachers in the junior high classes (Evertson & Emmer, 1982; Emmer, Note 9), but had in elementary classes (Emmer, Sanford, Evertson, Clements & Martin, Note 6). In the present study this area of management was supported by significant, low to moderate correlations of several variables with student behavior criteria. Other areas that received weak or moderate support in the present study include variables relating to consequence systems, first week activities, and adjusting instruction for special groups of students. The authors will comment on some of these areas later. The areas that received the strongest support by correlations with student behavior criteria in this study were developing workable classroom procedures and rules, fostering student accountability for work, key behavior management skills (consistency, effective monitoring, stopping inappropriate behavior quickly), instructional clarity, and skills in organizing and pacing instruction. Results for classroom procedures and rules confirmed earlier findings (Emmer, Note 9) about the importance of workable procedures and routines for essential aspects of whole class instruction: student participation in class discussion, ways for students to get help or attention from the teacher, student movement in the room, routines for opening and closing the class period, and other administrative routines that allow for efficient use of class time. Teachers' decisions about these basic aspects of classroom functioning appear to be crucial for avoiding disruption and for fostering task engagement in junior high school classes.

In this study particular attention was given to procedures for promoting student responsibility for their work in class: communicating assignments, checking and collecting work, monitoring student progress, providing feedback to students about their work, and generally requiring students to meet reasonable work standards. These variables received strong support from correlations with on task and disruptive student behavior measures. Exceptions were variables describing regular academic feedback and a close relationship of class activities to grades. Neither of these variables as measured by Narrative Reader Ratings were significantly correlated with the management criteria, although a previous study of the first 3 weeks of school had indicated that Regular academic feedback was a variable that distinguished more and less effective managers (Evertson & Emmer, 1982). It may be that the quality or kind of academic feedback may be more important than the frequency or emphasis on grades throughout the year.

Correlations in this study provided strong support for key "maintaining" strategies identified by earlier research (monitoring student behavior closely and responding to misbehavior quickly and consistently). No <u>specific</u> strategies for responding to inappropriate or disruptive behavior were significantly related to management success. Results in the Junior High Classroom Organization Study (Evertson & Emmer, 1982) indicated that citing rules and procedures to stop inappropriate behavior was used by more effective teachers in the first 3 weeks of school. It seems reasonable that this strategy might be used more effectively during the beginning of the school year than throughout the remainder of the year.

Aspects of instructional clarity, including describing objectives clearly, clear directions, getting students' attention, clear explanations, monitoring students' understanding, and avoiding digressions, were significantly related to management success in this study as they had been in other studies of classroom management and teacher effectiveness (Evertson & Emmer, 1982; Good, Note 2; Emmer, Note 9). Results for the area of Organizing instruction supported earlier findings for the importance of readiness of materials, good pacing of lessons, and planning sufficient quantities of appropriate work for students.

A related area, Adjusting instruction for special groups of students, was one in which results were somewhat weaker. Significant, moderate correlations (r = .44 to .55) were obtained between both management criteria and two variables assessing the match between difficulty levels of classroom activities and student ability: a general student success rating and a rating based on evidence of unmet needs of lower or higher ability students in the class. As in earlier studies (Evertson & Emmer, 1982; Fisher et al., 1980; Emmer, Note 9), student success was related to task engagement and disruption. However, this set of analyses provided no evidence that effective junior high managers promote student success by providing different assignments and activities for different students. A study of effective mathematics teachers in the JHCOS (Emmer, Note 9) suggested that more effective math teachers provide differentiated assignments, but the beginning of the year results for all (English and mathematics) teachers in that study found no significant results for differentiated assignments or variety of materials. Effective managers in this sample of teachers in

different subject areas used a variety of means to provide appropriate levels of instruction for different students in their classes.

One weakly supported area of management variables in this analysis was Activities for the first week of school. Of nine variables assessing this area, only three were significantly related to either student behavior criterion: Teacher stays in charge of all students, Materials are ready (first week only), and Procedures and rules generally well taught. More specific aspects of how rules and procedures were introduced to students were not significant. Combined with results for the area of Formulating classroom rules and procedures, these results suggest that although effective managers must have workable, well thought out classroom procedures, how these procedures are introduced to students at the beginning of the year is not critical. There are alternative hypotheses, however. It may be that in the sample as a whole, teachers were well prepared for the beginning of the year, and there was not much variation in the way they oriented students to their classroom expectations. Statistics for these variables suggest this may be true. As noted previously, the teachers in this sample as a whole were relatively competent classroom managers. In addition, considering that variables in this area of management were assessed only during the first week of school, temporal factors could have affected statistical relationships with the student behavior measures that were based on observations throughout the year.

Finally, few significant relationships were found between the management criteria and variables describing consequence systems. Only two (of six) variables, Rewarding appropriate behavior and System of consequences is generally appropriate, sufficient, and effective, were

significantly related to either student behavior criterion. Rewarding appropriate behavior was related negatively to disruptive behavior, but was not related to task engagement. No significant relationships were found for Definition of or Use of negative consequences. All of these variables were assessed through Narrative Reader Ratings. It was noted in this study and in previous studies that effective managers varied considerably in the complexity and publicness of consequence systems in use in their classes. In some effective managers' classes, consequence systems were almost invisible. These teachers generally used very unobtrusive ways of stopping inappropriate student behavior or dealing with task avoidance, so that little information about consequences was recorded in narratives. In other effective managers' classes, more overt, systematic use of rewards and deterrents was evident.

Junior high/elementary school differences. A similar study of classroom management in grades one through six (Emmer, Sanford, Evertson, Clements, & Martin, Note 6) affords comparison of classroom management strategies that appeared to be important in the two different settings. Similar management variables and student behavior criteria were used in the two studies. In the elementary study, different relationships were found between the teacher behaviors and the two different student behavior criteria, on task proportion (student engagement) and disruption. Student engagement was more closely related to teachers' monitoring of student behavior and understanding and to instructional organization variables. Disruptive student behavior was more closely linked to appropriate procedures and rules, strategies for monitoring student behavior, and stopping misbehavior quickly. In the junior high school results, more teacher variables were related to both

of the student behavior criteria, because the two student behavior criteria were more closely correlated in the junior high school study (r = -.62) than in the elementary study (r = -.46). One way to interpret this difference in the intercorrelations is that, compared with elementary students, junior high school students who are not on task are more likely to be disruptive. For many mangement behavior variables, relationships with student disruption were stronger at the junior high school level than at the elementary grades. For example, enforcing work standards, monitoring student progress, ignoring inappropriate behavior, describing objectives clearly, materials are ready, and attention spans considered in lesson all had stronger relationships with student disruption in junior high school classes than they did in elementary classes. The age group and/or the structure of junior high school classes may account for these differences. Other differences between management at elementary and junior high school grade levels are summarized for the different aspects of management below.

1. Organizing classroom space and materials. This area appears to be more important at the elementary grades. In the elementary study more variables were reliably assessed and more were related to on task rates than in junior high.

2. Classroom procedures and rules. Similar patterns of strong relationships were found in both elementary and junior high school, indicating the importance of procedures central to the functioning of the classroom. Procedures for small group instruction were important in elementary grades but not in junior high school.

3. Accountability. Significant relationships were found in both elementary and junior high school, but relationships were stronger in

junior high grades. In secondary grades, but not in elementary, accountability procedures seemed to be more closely related to avoiding disruption than to maintaining task engagement.

4. Consequences. Somewhat more relationships between consequence variables and management success were found in elementary grades than in secondary grades. Using negative consequences consistently was related to task engagement in elementary grades but not in junior high grades.

5. First week of school. The manner in which procedures and rules are taught to students appears to have more relationship to management success in elementary than in junior high grades.

6. Maintaining. Strong patterns of relationships for variables in this area were found at both elementary and junior high levels.

7. Clarity. This aspect of management and instruction appears to be equally important in elementary and junior high school grades, although it appears to be more closely linked with task engagement at the elementary level and with avoiding disruption at the junior high level.

8. Organizing instruction. Instructional pacing, conducting transitions, and student success appear to be equally important in elementary and junior high grade levels. Again, instructional variables appear to be more closely linked with avoiding student disruption in junior high school grades than they are in elementary grades.

Finally, let us consider the match between management strategies most strongly supported by correlations with student behavior criteria and management behaviors for which treatment effects were achieved in the current field experiment. As noted above, the management areas that correlational analysis suggest are most important at the junior high

level include workable classroom procedures and rules, accountability procedures, the "maintaining" skills of monitoring and stopping inappropriate behavior quickly, instructional clarity, good pacing of lessons and conduct of transitions, and planning sufficient, appropriate work for students. Treatment effects were achieved for important variables in each of these areas, but fewer were found in the area of instructional clarity. Treatment effects were found for two specific well-supported clarity strategies, Waits for attention and Monitors student understanding, but no treatment effects were achieved for more general measures of clearness. Instructional clarity is an area that demands more attention.

Class Context Effects

Although the question of how differences in class composition or subject area affect classroom management was not a major focus of this study, the sample size and variety of classes permitted an exploratory investigation of this question. Context variables investigated included subject area (English, mathematics, science, and social studies), class size, percent male/female students, percent students of four different ethnic groups, and (for 52 classes) class average academic achievement level. Class context analyses for this report were limited to investigation of relationships between context variables and the five student behavior variables that were used as management criteria in the study. Results provide preliminary information about how class composition or subject area affects classroom management success. In general, results results confirm previous research suggesting that teachers have much more impact on students' classroom behavior than does class composition or other context effects. No significant or near significant relation-

ships were found between any student behavior measure and the following context variables: subject area, class size, or percent Mexican American, Black, Asian, or Anglo students. Significant but low correlations were found between on task rates and percent female students (r = .25) and between average entering mathematics and reading scores and task orientation (r = .29). Relationships between achievement scores and other student behavior variables approached significance, but these class ability/student behavior results are weaker than those suggested by some previous studies of junior high classes. In two analyses demonstrating strong class ability level effects (Evertson, 1982; Metz, 1980), teacher effects were controlled by comparing classes of different ability tracks taught by the same teachers. In an earlier study of classroom process variables in 136 mathematics and English classes (Veldman & Sanford, 1982) class ability level was significantly related to frequency of student misbehavior, behavioral and procedural contacts, and student call outs. The strongest class ability effects were for the variable, Mild misbehaviors, a process variable one would expect to correlate highly (negatively) with On task proportion. In mathematics, class ability level contributed 26% of the variance in the measure of Mild misbehavior, and in English, class ability contributed 17%. Differences in the these results for the two studies may be related to differences in the two teacher sample populations. There is evidence that the teachers in the present study were on the whole relatively strong in classroom management skills. They may have compensated for class ability effects (i.e., they were more successful in maintaining the cooperation of lower ability classes).

Results for the sex composition variables are difficult to interpret because a significant relationship was found for only one of the five student behavior variables, on task (r = .25). Correlations with off task, disruptive, and inappropriate behavior and task orientation approached 0. Some recent research on class size (Filby, Cahen, McCutcheon, & Kyle, Note 10) suggests a significant impact of this variable on effective instruction, but no significant or near significant correlations with student behavior were obtained in our study, in which classes ranging in size from 12 to 35 students. Ethnic composition analyses yielded no significant relationships either, and management outcomes did not appear to vary across the four subject areas. In summary, results of this set of analyses lend little support for emphasizing most of these classroom context variables as factors affecting classroom behavior or management outcomes. However, classroom experience and research results suggest that different methods or strategies for management and instruction are called for in classes of different ability levels and different subject areas. A productive future research strategy would be to describe how effective teachers manage instruction in these situations. Such description is beyond the scope of the present report, but will be the subject of future reports and studies by the Research on Classroom Learning and Teaching Program.

Summary and Implications

In this field experiment on classroom management in junior high and middle school grades, experimental group teachers in four content areas received a manual and two workshops at the beginning of the school year. Extensive classroom observation of both the experimental teachers and the control group of teachers assessed implementation of recommended

management practices. Observations also assessed the effects of use of the recommended practices on student cooperation and task engagement. Teacher interviews and questionnaires provided additional information about teachers' use of the training materials.

Results of the study confirmed the importance of most of the areas of classroom management that had previously been identified by descriptive/correlational research in junior high schools. The management areas most strongly supported by relationships with student behavior criteria in this study included workable classroom procedures and rules, procedures for promoting student responsibility for work, teacher's skill in monitoring student behavior and stopping inappropriate behavior quickly, instructional clarity, good pacing of lessons and conduct of transitions, and planning sufficient, appropriate work for students.

Based on observations in the first 2 months of school, significant treatment effects were obtained in most of the nine areas of management addressed in the training materials and workshops. Treatment group teachers used the recommended management practices significantly more and established classes with more appropriate, task oriented student behavior. Middle-of-the-year results were inconclusive because of sample attrition, and results were poor for a small subsample of experienced teachers with histories of management difficulties. Nevertheless, results of the study provide strong evidence of the effectiveness of most of the recommended management practices, and results suggest that research based teacher education on classroom management could help many teachers establish better learning environments in junior high and middle school classes. This student age group is widely perceived as problematic for classroom management.

Compared with elementary teacher education programs, secondary teacher education often provides little information to teachers about classroom management and organization. In interviews in this study, most teachers confirmed this lack of training, and many said they found the treatment materials useful because they provided detailed, practical information. Results of the JMIS add to the knowledge base for improving both preservice teacher education programs and inservice staff development.

Reference Notes

1. Brophy, J. The student as unit of analysis. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April, 1977.

2. Good, T. Classroom research: What we know and what we need to know (R&D Rep. No. 9018). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1982.

3. Emmer, E. Effective classroom management in junior high school mathematics classrooms (R&D Rep. No. 6111). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1981.

4. Veldman, D. J., & Sanford, J. P. The influence of class ability level on student achievement and classroom behavior (R&D Rep. No. 4095). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1982.

5. Evertson, C., Anderson, L., & Brophy, J. Texas Junior High School Study: Final report of process-outcome relationships (R&D Rep. No. 4061). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 173 744).

6. Emmer, E., Sanford, J., Evertson, C., Clements, B., & Martin, J. The Classroom Management Improvement Study: An experiment in elementary school classrooms (R&D Rep. 6050). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1981.

7. Crawford, J., & Stallings, J. Experimental effects of in-service teacher training derived from process-product correlations in the primary grades. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

8. Emmer, E., Evertson, C., Sanford, J., Clements, B., & Worsham, M. Organizing and managing the junior high school classroom (R&D Rep. No. 6151). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1982.

9. Emmer, E. T. Management strategies in elementary school classrooms (R&D Rep. No. 6052). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1982.

10. Filby, N., Cahen, L., McCutcheon, G., & Kyle, D. What happens in smaller classes? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1978.

References

Anderson, L., Evertson, C., & Brophy, J. An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. Elementary School Journal, 1979, 79, 193-223.

Arlin, M. Teacher transitions can disrupt time flow in classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 1979, 16, 42-56.

Beckerman, T., & Good, T. The classroom ratio of high- and low-aptitude students and its effect on achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 1981, 18, 317-327.

Benowitz, M., & Busse, T. Effects of material incentives on classroom learning over a four-week period. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1976, 68, 57-62.

Bloom, B. Human characteristics and school learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Borg, W. R. Time and school learning. In C. Denham and A. Lieberman (Eds.), Time to learn. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, 1980.

Brophy, J. E. How teachers influence what is taught and learned in classrooms. Elementary School Journal, 1982, 83, 1-13.

Brophy, J. E. Teacher behavior and its effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71(6), 733-750.

Brophy, J., & Putnam, J. Classroom management in the elementary grades. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management. 78th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part 2). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Carnine, D. Effects of two teacher-presentation rates on off-task behavior, answering correctly, and participation. Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis, 1976, 9, 199-206.

Doyle, W. Making managerial decisions in classrooms. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management. 78th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part 2). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Doyle, W. Paradigms for research on teaching. In T. Husen and T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), International enclyclopedia of education: Research and studies. Oxford: Pergamon, in press.

Duke, D. (Ed.) Classroom management. 78th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part 2). Skokie, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Duke, D. (Ed.) Helping teachers manage classrooms. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Dunkin, M., & Biddle, B. The study of teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1974.

Emmer, E. T. Classroom management in the elementary grades. In T. Husen and T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), International encyclopedia of education: Research and studies. Oxford: Pergamon, in press.

Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. M. Synthesis of research in classroom management. Educational Leadership, 1981, 38(4), 342-347.

Emmer, E., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. Elementary School Journal, 1980, 80(5), 219-231.

Evertson, C. M. Differences in instructional activities in higher- and lower-achieving junior high English and math classes. Elementary School Journal, 1982, 82, 329-350.

Evertson, C. M., & Emmer, E. T. Effective management at the beginning of the year in junior high classes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1982, 74(4), 485-498.

Evertson, C. M., Emmer, E. T., Sanford, J. P., & Clements, B. S. Improving classroom management: An experiment in elementary classrooms. Elementary School Journal, in press.

Evertson, C. M., Sanford, J. P., & Emmer, E. T. Effects of class heterogeneity in junior high school. American Educational Research Journal, 1981, 18(2), 219-232.

Fisher, C., Berliner, D., Filby, M/. Marliave, R., Cahan, L., & Dishaw, M. Teaching behaviors, academic learning time, and student achievement: An overview. In C. Denham and A. Lieberman (Eds.), Time to learn. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, 1980.

Frederick, C. W., & Walberg, H. J. Learning as a function of time. Journal of Educational Research, 1980, 73, 183-194.

Good, T. Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30(2), 52-64.

Good, T., & Grouws, D. The Missouri Mathematics Effectiveness Project: An experimental study in fourth-grade classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 355-362.

Goss, S. S., & Ingersoll, G. M. Management of disruptive and off task behaviors: Selected resources. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1981.

Jones, F. H., Fremouw, W., & Carples, S. Pyramid training of elementary school teachers to use a classroom management "skill package." Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis, 1977, 10(2), 239-253.

Kounin, J. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.

Kounin, J., & Doyle, W. Degree of continuity of a lesson's signal system and the task involvement of children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67(2), 159-164.

Lortie, D. Schoolteacher. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

McDonald, F. J. Research on teaching: Report of Phase II of the Beginning Teachers Evaluation Study. In G. Borich, The appraisal of teaching: Concepts and process. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Medley, D. Teacher competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of process-product research. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Metz, M. Clashes in the classroom: the importance of norms for authority. Education and Urban Society, 1980, 11(1), 13-47.

Moskowitz, G., & Hayman, J. Success strategies of inner-city teachers: A year-long study. Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 69, 283-289.

Pigge, F. Teacher competencies: Need, proficiency, and where the proficiency was developed. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29, 70-76.

Rosenshine, B. Content, time, and direct instruction. In P. L. Peterson and H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Research on teaching. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1979.

Sanford, J. P., & Evertson, C. M. Classroom management in a low SES junior high: Three case studies. Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32(1), 34-38.

Table 1

Years of Teaching Experience for JMIS Teachers

	0 years	1 years	2 years	3+ years
Experimental Group Teachers	5	9	4	6
Control Group Teachers	6	9	5	4
Totals	11	18	9	10

Table 2

Subject Areas Taught by JMIS Teachers

Subject Area	Treatment Group Teachers	Control Group Teachers	Total
English	7	6	13
Mathematics	9	6	15
Science	4	9	13
Social Studies	4	3	7
Totals	24	24	48

Table 3

Grade Levels of JMIS Classes[a]

(n = 122)

Grade Levels	Taught by Experimental Group Teachers	Taught by Control Group Teachers	Totals
6	6	7	13
7	21	16	37
8	21	25	46
Totals	48	48	96

[a] Two classes observed per teacher.

Table 4

Reliability Estimates of Student Engagement Ratings

Variable	Reliability	Significance Level $p \leq$
Average success rating	.51	.05
Definitely on task, academic	.93	.001
Probably on task, academic	.36	ns
Definitely on task, procedural	.90	.001
Probably on task, procedural	.14	ns
Off task, sanctioned	.88	.001
Off task, unsanctioned	.83	.001
Dead time	.94	.001
On task, academic	.96	.001
On task, procedural	.92	.001
On task	.87	.001

Table 5

Reliability Estimates of Observer Summary Ratings

Variable	Reliability	Significance Level $p \leq$
Readiness of class	.78	.001
Teacher lets class gets out of hand with half or more pupils off task	.76	.001
Frequency of wandering that is not task related	.69	.001
Noise level of classroom in general	.81	.001
Teacher's expectation regarding talk among students during seatwork	.45	.01
Efficiency of transitions between activities or formats	.71	.001
Frequency of come-ups while teacher is engaged with other students	.55	.001
Teacher usually responds to come-ups by:		
Ignoring student	.17	ns
Telling student to sit down	.00	ns
Answering student's question	.07	ns
Frequency with which students:		
Approach teacher when need help	.51	.001
Raise hands when need help from teacher	.53	.001
Call out when need help from teacher	.77	.001
Frequency with which the teacher left the room during observations	.00	ns
Teacher handles disruptions well	.78	.001
Efficient use of available classroom space	.40	.01
Readiness of teacher for first week of school in terms of equipment	.00	ns
Teacher consistently plans enough work for students	.57	.001

Table 5, continued

Variable	Reliability	Significance Level $p \leq$
Assignments are generally too hard	.29	ns
Teacher allows activities to continue too long	.49	.01
Typical assignments are too short or easy	.46	.01
Number of students who use free-time materials during observations	.08	ns
When giving instructions, teacher questions to determine student understanding	.44	.01
Teacher was successful in holding students accountable for work	.62	.001
Effective routines for communicating assignments	.42	.01
Frequency of academic feedback:		
Notes on papers	.01	ns
Messages in small groups	.05	ns
Grades on papers	.67	.001
Papers on bulletin boards	.31	.05
Verbal citing of students in front of class	.40	.01
Individual conferences with teacher	.58	.001
Evaluative comments to class as whole	.34	.05
Other	.13	ns
Teacher was confident and relaxed the first weeks of school	.56	.001
Teacher was warm and pleasant toward the children	.67	.001
Teacher was enthusiastic	.72	.001
Showmanship of teacher	.69	.001

Table 6

Reliability Estimates of Component Ratings

Variable	Reliability	Significance Level $p \leq$
Describes objectives clearly	.47	.001
Variety of materials	.51	.001
Materials are ready	.33	.01
Clear directions	.51	.001
Waits for attention	.70	.001
Encourages analysis/builds reasoning skills	.49	.001
Different assignments and activities for different students	.33	.01
Appropriate pacing of lessons	.49	.001
Clear explanations and presentations	.53	.001
Monitors student understanding	.41	.001
Consistently enforces work standards	.65	.001
Suitable traffic patterns	.30	.05
Degree of visibility	.01	ns
Efficient administrative routines	.57	.001
Appropriate general procedures	.73	.001
Suitable routines for assigning, checking, collecting work	.56	.001
Efficient opening and closing routines	.55	.001
Student success	.48	.001
Student aggression	.51	.001
Attention spans considered in lesson	.50	.001

Table 6, continued

Variable	Reliability	Significance Level $p \leq$
Activities related to student interests/backgrounds	.52	.001
Restrictions on student discretionary behaviors	.56	.001
Rewards appropriate performance	.55	.001
Signals appropriate behavior	.14	ns
Consistency in managing behavior	.75	.001
Effective monitoring	.61	.001
Amount of disruption	.72	.001
Source of disruption	.67	.001
Stops disruption quickly	.34	ns
Cites rules or procedures to stop disruption	.39	.05
Uses nonverbal contact to stop disruptions	.00	ns
Uses desist statements to stop disruptions	.38	.05
Uses criticism to stop disruptions	.06	ns
Uses penalties to stop disruptions	.63	.001
Ignores disruption	.16	ns
Amount of inappropriate behavior	.73	.001
Source of inappropriate behavior	.66	.001
Stops inappropriate behavior quickly	.61	.001
Cites rules of procedures to stop inappropriate behavior	.48	.001
Uses nonverbal contact to stop inappropriate behavior	.00	ns
Uses desist statement to stop inappropriate behavior	.39	.01
Criticizes to stop inappropriate behavior	.28	.05

Table 6, continued

Variable	Reliability	Significance Level $p \leq$
Uses penalties to stop inappropriate behavior	.45	.001
Ignores inappropriate behavior	.47	.001
Conveys value of curriculum	.34	.01
Students have task-oriented focus	.75	.001
Class has relaxed, pleasant atmosphere	.47	.001
Teacher has distracting mannerisms	.61	.001
Teacher displays listening skills	.40	.001
Externally imposed interruptions	.18	ns
Manages interruptions	.26	.05
Avoidance behavior during seatwork	.70	.001
Participation in discussion/recitation	.29	.05

Table 7

Reliability Estimates of Narrative Ratings

Variable	Reliability	Significance Level $p \leq$
During the first week of school, room was orderly, well organized	.50	.01
Teacher uses students as helpers for administrative and procedural jobs	.84	.001
Regular academic feedback to students	.67	.001
Work requirements are clear	.61	.001
Deadlines are enforced consistently	.43	.01
Consistent routines for communicating assignments to students	.48	.01
Effectively monitors student progress and completion of assignment	.56	.001
Regular, efficient routines for checking, turning in and returning graded work	.46	.01
Procedures and rules are well taught	.67	.001
Rewards or positive consequences for appropriate behavior are clearly defined	.80	.001
Rewards or positive consequences are used consistently	.63	.001
Negative consequences are clearly defined	.68	.001
Teacher follows through with negative consequences consistently	.63	.001
Teacher clearly ties class activities to grading system	.60	.001
System of consequences is appropriate, sufficient, and effective	.60	.001

Table 7, continued

Variable	Reliability	Significance Level $p \leq$
Teacher monitors at the beginning of activities	.54	.01
Effective conduct of transitions	.71	.001
Frequent problems with students not bringing materials to class	.57	.001
Frequent problems with use of materials, supplies, and equipment in class	.40	.05
Frequent problems caused by interruptions outside class	.62	.001
Needs of highest and lowest ability students are not being met	.56	.001
Frequency of digressions, irrelevant comments, and sustained interruptions during instruction	.60	.001
Problems with beginning class procedures	.66	.001
Problems with tardiness procedures	.50	.01
Problems with students out-of-room	.41	.05
Problems with ending class procedures	.48	.01
Problems with student talk during whole class seatwork activities	.65	.001
Problems with response/questions during whole class seatwork activities	.64	.001
Problems with students out-of-seat during whole class seatwork activities	.58	.001
Problems with students after they complete work during whole class seatwork activities	.59	.001

Table 8

Indicators of Manual Implementation

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Chapter 1: Organizing Your Room and Materials for the Beginning of School			
Suitable traffic patterns (CR2a)	4.16	4.04	ns
Efficient use of classroom space (ORT16)	4.02	3.75	ns
During the first 5 days of school room is orderly, well organized (NRR1)	4.28	3.90	.07
Chapter 2: Developing a Workable Set of Rules and Procedures			
Efficient administrative routines (CR3a)	4.14	3.75	.01
Appropriate general procedures (CR3b)	3.88	3.43	.03
Efficient opening and closing routines (CR3e)	3.67	3.02	<.001
Manages interruptions (CR9d)	4.28	3.93	.04
Frequency of wandering that is not task related (ORT3)	1.57	2.28	.02
Frequency of come ups while teacher is engaged with other students (ORT7)	1.85	2.36	.06
Frequency with which students approach teacher when they need help (ORT11)	2.28	3.11	<.01
Frequency with which students raise hands when they need help from teacher (ORT12)	3.87	3.27	.001

Note: CR = Component Ratings; AdCR = Addendum Component Ratings; ORT = Observer Ratings of Teacher; NRR = Narrative Reader Ratings

Table 8, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Frequency with which students call out when they need help (ORT13)	2.01	2.91	<.01
Frequent problems with students not bringing materials to class (NRR18)	2.06	1.95	ns
Problems with beginning class procedures (NRR23)	2.25	2.75	.08
Problems with tardiness procedures (NRR24)	2.14	2.13	ns
Problems with procedures for students leaving the room (NRR25)	1.67	1.98	ns
Problems with ending-class procedures (NRR26)	1.94	2.48	.04
Problems with student talk during whole class or seatwork activities (NRR27)	2.86	3.50	.02
Problems with response/questions during whole class or seatwork activities (NRR28)	2.61	2.98	ns
Problems with students out of seat during whole class/seatwork activities (NRR29)	2.14	2.98	<.001
Chapter 3: Student Accountability			
Consistently enforces work standards (CR1k)	3.68	3.12	.01
Suitable routines for assigning, checking, and collecting work (CR3d)	3.85	3.51	.02
Teacher was successful in holding students accountable for work (ORT24)	4.13	3.55	.03
Effective routines for communicating assignments (ORT25)	4.25	3.62	.01

Table 8, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Regular academic feedback to students (NRR3)	3.64	3.20	.10
Work requirements are clear (NRR4)	3.72	3.25	.06
Deadlines are enforced consistently (NRR5)	3.64	3.25	.06
Consistent routines for communicating assignments to students (NRR6)	3.97	3.28	<.01
Effectively monitors students' progress and completion of assignments (NRR7)	3.83	3.33	.02
Regular, efficient routines for checking, turning in, and grading work (NRR8)	3.81	3.28	.03
Teacher clearly ties class activities to grading system (NRR14)	3.56	3.28	ns
Chapter 4: Consequences			
Rewards appropriate behavior (CR5b)	2.50	1.94	.03
Rewards or positive consequences for appropriate behavior are clearly defined (NRR10)	2.28	1.65	.07
Rewards or positive consequences are used consistently (NRR11)	2.28	1.75	.10
Negative consequences are clearly defined (NRR12)	3.22	2.80	ns
Teacher follows through with negative consequences consistently (NRR13)	3.08	2.13	.001
System of consequences is appropriate, sufficient, and effective (NRR15)	3.53	2.63	<.01

Table 8, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Chapter 5: Planning Activities for the First Week			
Teacher presents reviews or discusses rules and procedures (ADCR1)	3.09	2.61	.06
Presentation of rules, procedures, and penalties is clear (ADCR2)	3.92	3.69	ns
Rationale for rules and procedures is explained (ADCR3)	3.05	2.77	ns
Presentation of rules and procedures includes rehearsal or practice (ADCR4)	1.96	1.43	.07
Teacher provides feedback or review of rules and procedures (ADCR5)	2.93	2.32	.04
Teacher stays in charge of all students (ADCR6)	4.59	4.38	ns
Materials are ready (CR1c--First week only)	4.31	4.45	ns
Conveys value or curriculum (CR8a--First week only)	3.04	2.49	ns
Procedures and rules are well taught (NRR9)	3.86	3.10	<.01
Chapter 6: Maintaining Your Management System			
Consistency in managing behavior (CR5d)	3.70	3.14	.02
Effective monitoring (CR5e)	3.87	3.10	<.001
Cites rules or procedures to stop disruption (CR6d)	2.17	2.07	ns
Stops inappropriate behavior quickly (CR7c)	3.86	3.18	<.01
Cites rules or procedures to stop inappropriate behavior (CR7d)	2.65	2.07	.02

Table 8, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Ignores inappropriate behavior (CR7i)	2.25	2.89	.01
Teacher lets class get out of hand with half or more pupils off task (ORT2)	1.68	2.51	.03
Teacher handles disruptions well (ORT15)	4.23	3.50	.04
Teacher monitors at the beginning of activities (NRR16)	3.61	2.95	<.01
Chapter 7: Instructional Clarity			
Describes objectives clearly (CR1a)	3.35	3.05	ns
Clear directions (CR1d)	3.91	3.68	ns
Waits for attention (CR1e)	3.84	3.30	.02
Clear explanations and presentations (CR1i)	3.77	3.49	ns
Monitors student understanding (CR1j)	3.72	3.19	<.01
When giving instructions teacher questions to determine student understanding (ORT23)	3.61	3.17	ns
Frequency of digressions, irrelevant comments, and sustained interruptions during instruction (NRR22)	1.75	1.93	ns
Chapter 8: Organizing Instruction			
Materials are ready (CR1c)	4.47	4.40	ns
Appropriate pacing of lessons (CR1h)	3.64	3.37	ns
Attention spans considered in lesson (CR4c)	3.62	3.28	.06

Table 8, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
What is the efficiency of transitions? (ORT6)	4.07	3.45	.03
Teacher consistently plans enough work for students (ORT18)	4.47	3.72	.001
Teacher allows activities to continue too long (ORT20)	2.23	2.54	ns
Typical assignments are too short or easy (ORT21)	1.62	2.07	.03
Effective conduct of transitions (NRR17)	3.64	3.08	.02
Frequent problems with use of materials, supplies, and equipment in class (NRR19)	1.50	2.10	<.01
Problems with students after they complete work during whole class/ seatwork activities (NRR30)	2.36	3.00	.02
Chapter 9: Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups			
Student success (CR4a)	4.05	3.77	.10
Different assignments and activities for different students (CR1g)	1.29	1.25	ns
Needs of highest and lowest ability students are not being met (NRR21)	2.14	2.50	ns

Table 9

Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance of Classroom Management Variables

Variable	Main effects for groups: Treatment (n = 18)	Main effects for groups: Control (n = 20)	Main effects for groups: p	Main effects for time: Week 1	Main effects for time: Weeks 2 to 4	Main effects for time: Weeks 5 to 8	Main effects for time: p	Interaction p
Component Rating Variables (5-point scale)								
Disruptive behavior	1.31	1.53	ns	1.34	1.35	1.57	.02	ns
Inappropriate behavior	2.13	2.63	.06	2.35	2.34	2.46	ns	ns
Task Orientation	3.79	3.41	.05	3.63	3.61	3.56	ns	ns
Student Engagement Variables								
Proportion of students off-task, unsanctioned	.04	.06	.04	.04	.05	.06	<.01	ns
Proportion of students on-task	.91	.85	.01	.88	.89	.86	.07	ns

Table 10

Differences Between Experimental and Control Group Averages on Variables Potentially Susceptible to Halo Errors, But Not Directly Related to the Treatment

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Class had relaxed pleasant atmosphere (CR8c)	3.68	3.55	ns
Teacher used criticism to stop inappropriate behavior (CR7g)	1.18	1.18	ns
Participation in discussion and recitation (CR9f)	3.17	3.10	ns
Teacher was warm and pleasant (ORT35)	3.53	3.54	ns
Teacher was enthusiastic (ORT36)	3.50	3.14	ns
Showmanship of teacher (ORT37)	2.59	2.36	ns
Encourages analysis, builds reasoning skills (CR1f)	2.95	2.67	ns

Table 11

Indicators of Manual Implementation for

Experienced-Management Problem Teachers

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 6)	Control Group Means (n = 4)	p
Chapter 1: Organizing Your Room and Materials for the Beginning of School			
Suitable traffic patterns (CR2a)	4.40	4.05	ns
Efficient use of classroom space (ORT16)	3.61	3.17	ns
During the first 5 days of school room is orderly, well organized (NRR1)	4.25	4.00	ns
Chapter 2: Developing a Workable Set or Rules and Procedures			
Efficient administrative routines (CR3a)	4.30	3.91	ns
Appropriate general procedures (CR3b)	3.82	3.28	ns
Efficient opening and closing routines (CR3e)	3.43	3.15	ns
Manages interruptions (CR9d)	4.08	4.08	ns
Frequency of wandering that is not task related (ORT3)	1.78	2.21	ns
Frequency of come ups while teacher is engaged with other students (ORT7)	1.89	2.00	ns
Frequency with which students approach teacher when they need help (ORT11)	2.64	2.79	ns

Note: CR = Component Ratings; ADCR = Addendum Component Ratings; ORT = Observer Ratings of Teachers; NRR = Narrative Reader Ratings.

Table 11, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 6)	Control Group Means (n = 4)	p
Frequency with which students raise hands when they need help from teacher (ORT12)	3.58	3.25	ns
Frequency with which students call out when they need help (ORT13)	2.89	2.79	ns
Frequent problems with students not bringing materials to class (NRR18)	2.33	2.00	ns
Problems with beginning class procedures (NRR23)	2.67	2.50	ns
Problems with tardiness procedures (NRR24)	2.83	2.50	ns
Problems with procedures for students leaving the room (NRR25)	1.83	2.00	ns
Problems with ending-class procedures (NRR26)	2.33	3.25	ns
Problems with student talk during whole class or seatwork activities (NRR27)	3.42	3.75	ns
Problems with response/questions during whole class or seatwork activities (NRR28)	3.33	3.00	ns
Problems with students out of seat during whole class/seatwork activities (NRR29)	2.67	3.25	ns
Chapter 3: Student Accountability			
Consistently enforces work standards (CR1k)	3.57	3.21	ns
Suitable routines for assigning, checking, and collecting work (CR3d)	3.80	3.62	ns

Table 11, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 6)	Control Group Means (n = 4)	p
Teacher was successful in holding students accountable for work (ORT24)	4.03	3.33	ns
Effective routines for communicating assignments (ORT25)	4.22	4.09	ns
Regular academic feedback to students (NRR3)	3.75	3.25	ns
Work requirements are clear (NRR4)	3.83	3.13	.06
Deadlines are enforced consistently (NRR5)	3.58	3.00	ns
Consistent routines for communicating assignments to students (NRR6)	3.92	3.87	ns
Effectively monitors students' progress and completion of assignments (NRR7)	3.42	2.88	ns
Regular, efficient routines for checking, turning in, and grading work (NRR8)	3.25	3.13	ns
Teacher clearly ties class activities to grading system (NRR14)	3.50	3.13	ns
Chapter 4: Consequences			
Rewards appropriate behavior (CR5b)	1.78	1.47	ns
Rewards or positive consequences for appropriate behavior are clearly defined (NRR10)	1.58	1.88	ns
Rewards or positive consequences are used consistently (NRR11)	1.58	1.75	ns
Negative consequences are clearly defined (NRR12)	3.08	2.88	ns

Table 11, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 6)	Control Group Means (n = 4)	p
Teacher follows through with negative consequences consistently (NRR13)	2.75	2.13	ns
System of consequences is appropriate, sufficient, and effective (NRR15)	2.58	2.38	ns
Chapter 5: Planning Activities for the First Week			
Teacher presents reviews or discusses rules and procedures (ADCR1)	2.90	2.94	ns
Presentation of rules, procedures, and penalties is clear (ADCR2)	3.88	3.25	ns
Rationale for rules and procedures is explained (ADCR3)	2.89	2.48	ns
Presentation of rules and procedures includes rehearsal or practice (ADCR4)	1.94	1.31	ns
Teacher provides feedback or review of rules and procedures (ADCR5)	3.43	1.90	.01
Teacher stays in charge of all students (ADCR6)	4.25	4.54	ns
Materials are ready (CR1c--First week only)	4.53	4.36	ns
Conveys value or curriculum (CR8a--First week only)	3.14	2.71	ns
Procedures and rules are well taught (NRR9)	3.58	2.75	ns
Chapter 6: Maintaining Your Management System			
Consistency in managing behavior (CR5d)	3.42	3.12	ns
Effective monitoring (CR5e)	3.39	3.21	ns

Table 11, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 6)	Control Group Means (n = 4)	p
Cites rules or procedures to stop disruption (CR6d)	2.49	1.10	ns
Stops inappropriate behavior quickly (CR7c)	3.57	3.26	ns
Cites rules or procedures to stop inappropriate behavior (CR7d)	2.52	1.45	.07
Ignores inappropriate behavior (CR7i)	2.27	2.42	ns
Teacher lets class get out of hand with half or more pupils off task (ORT2)	2.17	2.13	ns
Teacher handles disruptions well (ORT15)	3.83	3.63	ns
Teacher monitors at the beginning of activities (NRR16)	2.83	2.50	ns
Chapter 7: Instructional Clarity			
Describes objectives clearly (CR1a)	3.29	3.23	ns
Clear directions (CR1d)	3.71	3.34	ns
Waits for attention (CR1e)	3.47	3.25	ns
Clear explanations and presentations (CR1i)	3.73	3.19	ns
Monitors student understanding (CR1j)	3.41	3.19	ns
When giving instructions teacher questions to determine student understanding (ORT23)	2.42	2.46	ns
Frequency of digressions, irrelevant comments, and sustained interruptions during instruction (NRR22)	2.50	2.63	ns

Table 11, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 6)	Control Group Means (n = 4)	p
Chapter 8: Organizing Instruction			
Materials are ready (CR1c)	4.22	4.09	ns
Appropriate pacing of lessons (CR1h)	3.69	3.35	ns
Attention spans considered in lesson (CR4c)	3.52	3.36	ns
What is the efficiency of transitions? (ORT6)	3.81	3.58	ns
Teacher consistently plans enough work for students (ORT18)	4.20	3.63	ns
Teacher allows activities to continue too long (ORT20)	1.83	2.38	ns
Typical assignments are too short or easy (ORT21)	1.75	2.04	ns
Effective conduct of transitions (NRR17)	3.08	2.75	ns
Frequent problems with use of materials, supplies, and equipment in class (NRR19)	1.75	1.88	ns
Problems with students after they complete work during whole class/ seatwork activities (NRR30)	3.00	3.13	ns
Chapter 9: Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups			
Student success (CR4a)	3.95	3.65	ns
Different assignments and activities for different students (CR1g)	1.21	1.34	ns
Needs of highest and lowest ability students are not being met (NRR21)	2.75	2.88	ns

Table 12

Comparison of Experimental and Content Group Mean Differences

for the Main Sample and the Experienced-Management Problem Subsample

Variable (Sig. for Less Exp.Ts)	More Experienced: Difference between T & C	More Experienced: p	Main Sample: Difference between T & C	Main Sample: p
SERs				
Average Success Rating %	.28	.30	.27	.14
Dead Time %	.01	.25	.01	.08
On Task %	-.01	.73	.06	.01
Off-Unsanctioned %	.00	.95	.02	.04
CRs				
Waits for Attention	.21	.66	.54	.02
Appropriate Pacing of Lessons	.34	.36	.27	.11
Monitors Student Understanding	.22	.58	.53	<.01
Consistently Enforces Work Standards	.36	.45	.56	.01
Efficient Administrative Routines	.38	.31	.39	.01
Appropriate General Procedures	.54	.33	.45	.03
Routines for Assigning, Checking & Collecting Work	.18	.63	.34	.02
Efficient Opening & Closing Routines	.28	.56	.65	<.001
Student Aggression	-.02	.75	.12	.03
Restrictions on Discretionary Behavior	.83	.05	.70	<.001
Rewards Appropriate Performance	.32	.37	.56	.03
Consistency in Managing Behavior	.30	.64	.56	.02

Table 12 (continued)

Variable (Sig. for Less Exp.Ts)	More Experienced Difference between T & C	p	Main Sample Difference between T & C	p
Does Teacher Plan Enough Work	.57	.36	.75	.001
Are Assignments Too Short, Easy	.29	.56	.45	.03
Students Held Accountable for Work	.70	.28	.58	.03
Effective Routines for Assignments	.14	.82	.63	.01
NRRs				
Consistent Routines for Communicating Assignments	.04	.93	.70	<.01
Effectively Monitors Student Progress	.54	.20	.51	.02
Regular, Efficient Routines for Checking Grading Assignments	.13	.83	.53	.03
Procedure and Rules Well Taught	.83	.27	.76	<.01
Teacher Follows Thru with Consequences Consistently	.63	.36	.96	.001
Consequences Appropriate, Sufficient, Effective	.21	.76	.90	<.01
Teacher Monitors Beginning of Activities	.33	.41	.66	<.01
Effective Conduct of Transitions	.33	.62	.56	.02
Frequent Problems with Use of Materials in Class	.13	.79	.60	<.01
Problems with Ending Class Procedure	.92	.20	.53	.04
Problems with Student Talk During Whole Class Seatwork	.34	.60	.64	.02
Problems with Students Out-of-Seat During Whole Class Seatwork	.59	.21	.84	<.001
Problems with Completing Work During Whole Class Seatwork	.13	.78	.64	.02

Table 12 (continued)

Variable (Sig. for Less Exp.Ts)	More Experienced: Difference between T & C	More Experienced: p	Main Sample: Difference between T & C	Main Sample: p
Does Teacher Plan Enough Work	.57	.36	.75	.001
Are Assignments Too Short, Easy	.29	.56	.45	.03
Students Held Accountable for Work	.70	.28	.58	.03
Effective Routines for Assignments	.14	.82	.63	.01
NRRs				
Consistent Routines for Communicating Assignments	.04	.93	.70	<.01
Effectively Monitors Student Progress	.54	.20	.51	.02
Regular, Efficient Routines for Checking Grading Assignments	.13	.83	.53	.03
Procedure and Rules Well Taught	.83	.27	.76	<.01
Teacher Follows Thru with Consequences Consistently	.63	.36	.96	.001
Consequences Appropriate, Sufficient, Effective	.21	.76	.90	<.01
Teacher Monitors Beginning of Activities	.33	.41	.66	<.01
Effective Conduct of Transitions	.33	.62	.56	.02
Frequent Problems with Use of Materials in Class	.13	.79	.60	<.01
Problems with Ending Class Procedure	.92	.20	.53	.04
Problems with Student Talk During Whole Class Seatwork	.34	.60	.64	.02
Problems with Students Out-of-Seat During Whole Class Seatwork	.59	.21	.84	<.001
Problems with Completing Work During Whole Class Seatwork	.13	.78	.64	.02

Table 13

Treatment Teachers' Responses to the Management Manual Questionnaire

Manual Section	Read and Studied				Usefulness			
	Fall		Spring		Fall		Spring	
	Main Sample	Exper.-Man. Problem	Main Sample	Exper.-Man. Problem	Main Sample	Exper.-Man. Problem	Main Sample	Exper.-Man. Problem
Chapter 1 Organizing for the Beginning of School	3.82	3.40	4.06	4.20	3.94	3.60	3.88	4.33
Chapter 2 Developing Rules and Procedures	4.06	4.40	4.50	4.25	4.47	4.20	4.50	4.33
Chapter 3 Student Accountability	3.65	3.00	3.94	4.00	4.06	4.00	3.88	3.83
Chapter 4 Consequences	3.47	3.25	3.94	4.20	3.93	3.75	3.75	4.00
Chapter 5 Planning Activities for the First Week	3.63	3.40	4.19	3.40	3.63	3.75	4.13	3.67
Chapter 6 Maintaining Your Management System	3.53	3.40	3.75	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.13	3.67
Chapter 7 Instructional Clarity	3.00	2.60	3.44	3.40	3.47	3.75	3.44	3.67

Table 13 (continued)

Manual Section	Read and Studied				Usefulness			
	Fall		Spring		Fall		Spring	
	Main Sample	Exper.-Man. Problem	Main Sample	Exper.-Man. Problem	Main Sample	Exper.-Man. Problem	Main Sample	Exper.-Man. Problem
Chapter 8 Organizing Instruction	2.88	2.80	3.38	2.80	3.36	3.75	3.56	3.83
Chapter 9 Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups	2.71	3.20	3.19	3.40	3.00	3.40	3.44	3.33

The Main Sample is a group of 18 experimental teachers who taught English, math, science, and social studies.

The Experimental Management Problem sample is a group of six more-experienced teachers with management problems who taught core subjects.

Table 14

Intercorrelation of Measures of Student

Cooperation and Task Engagement

	Task Oriented	Disruptive	Inappropriate	Off-task Unsanctioned	On task
Task Oriented		-.80**	-.85**	-.88**	.56**
Disruptive			.84**	.84**	-.62**
Inappropriate				.90**	-.65**
Off-task unsanctioned					-.71**
On-task					

**$p < .01$, $n = 76$ classes taught by 38 teachers

Table 15

Correlation of Indicators of Manual Implementation

With Measures of Student Cooperation and Task Engagement

Variables	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
Chapter 1: Organizing Your Room and Materials for the Beginning of School		
Suitable traffic patterns (CR2a)	-.12	.15
Efficient use of classroom space (ORT16)	-.68	.44
During the first 5 days of school room is orderly, well organized (NRR1)	-.34	.28
Chapter 2: Developing a Workable Set or Rules and Procedures		
Efficient administrative routines (CR3a)	-.67	.67
Appropriate general procedures (CR3b)	-.85	.62
Efficient opening and closing routines (CR3e)	-.71	.54
Manages interruptions (CR9d)	-.51	.46
Frequency of wandering that is not task related (ORT3)	.78	-.67
Frequency of come ups while teacher is engaged with other students (ORT7)	.45	-.60
Frequency with which students approach teacher when they need help (ORT11)	.27	-.51

Note: CR = Component Ratings; ADCR = Addendum Component Ratings; ORT = Observer Ratings of Teachers; NRR = Narrative Reader Ratings.

A single underscore indicates $p \leq .05$, and a double underscore indicates $p \leq .01$.

n = 76 classes, 38 teachers.

Table 15, continued

Variables	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
Frequency with which students raise hands when they need help from teacher (ORT12)	-.50	.53
Frequency with which students call out when they need help (ORT13)	.76	-.51
Frequent problems with students not bringing materials to class (NRR18)	.02	-.29
Problems with beginning class procedures (NRR23)	.68	-.35
Problems with tardiness procedures (NRR24)	.26	-.06
Problems with procedures for students leaving the room (NRR25)	.47	-.48
Problems with ending-class procedures (NRR26)	.74	-.39
Problems with student talk during whole class or seatwork activities (NRR27)	.79	-.47
Problems with response/questions during whole class or seatwork activities (NRR28)	.72	-.41
Problems with students out of seat during whole class/seatwork activities (NRR29)	.58	-.46
Chapter 3: Student Accountability		
Consistently enforces work standards (CR1k)	-.81	.63
Suitable routines for assigning, checking, and collecting work (CR3d)	-.67	.62
Teacher was successful in holding students accountable for work (ORT24)	-.62	.58

Table 15, continued

Variables	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
Effective routines for communicating assignments (ORT25)	-.71	.57
Regular academic feedback to students (NRR3)	-.31	.26
Work requirements are clear (NRR4)	-.44	.49
Deadlines are enforced consistently (NRR5)	-.43	.23
Consistent routines for communicating assignments to students (NRR6)	-.20	.19
Effectively monitors students' progress and completion of assignments (NRR7)	-.66	.46
Regular, efficient routines for checking, turning in, and grading work (NRR8)	-.52	.46
Teacher clearly ties class activities to grading system (NRR14)	-.29	.25
Chapter 4: Consequences		
Rewards appropriate behavior (CR5b)	-.36	.02
Rewards or positive consequences for appropriate behavior are clearly defined (NRR10)	-.12	-.12
Rewards or positive consequences are used consistently (NRR11)	-.16	.02
Negative consequences are clearly defined (NRR12)	-.17	.28
Teacher follows through with negative consequences consistently (NRR13)	-.24	-.11
System of consequences is appropriate, sufficient, and effective (NRR15)	-.74	.33

Table 15, continued

Variables	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
Chapter 5: Planning Activities for the First Week		
Teacher presents reviews or discusses rules and procedures (ADCR1)	.02	-.02
Presentation of rules, procedures, and penalties is clear (ADCR2)	-.11	.04
Rationale for rules and procedures is explained (ADCR3)	-.12	.06
Presentation of rules and procedures includes rehearsal or practice (ADCR4)	-.06	-.04
Teacher provides feedback or review of rules and procedures (ADCR5)	-.15	-.26
Teacher stays in charge of all students (ADCR6)	-.58	.63
Materials are ready (CR1c--First week only)	-.28	.53
Conveys value or curriculum (CR8a--First week only)	-.10	.03
Procedures and rules are well taught (NRR9)	-.57	.36
Chapter 6: Maintaining Your Management System		
Consistency in managing behavior (CR5d)	-.84	.63
Effective monitoring (CR5e)	-.73	.61
Cites rules or procedures to stop disruption (CR6d)	-.10	-.07
Stops inappropriate behavior quickly (CR7c)	-.84	.57
Cites rules or procedures to stop inappropriate behavior (CR7d)	-.02	-.23

Table 15, continued

Variables	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
Ignores inappropriate behavior (CR7i)	.65	-.41
Teacher lets class get out of hand with half or more pupils off task (ORT2)	.86	-.69
Teacher handles disruptions well (ORT15)	-.82	.57
Teacher monitors at the beginning of activities (NRR16)	-.52	.48
Chapter 7: Instructional Clarity		
Describes objectives clearly (CR1a)	-.61	.60
Clear directions (CR1d)	-.67	.59
Waits for attention (CR1e)	-.77	.54
Clear explanations and presentations (CR1i)	-.70	.55
Monitors student understanding (CR1j)	-.53	.39
When giving instructions teacher questions to determine student understanding (ORT23)	-.25	.26
Frequency of digressions, irrelevant comments, and sustained interruptions during instruction (NRR22)	.43	-.19
Chapter 8: Organizing Instruction		
Materials are ready (CR1c)	-.56	.53
Appropriate pacing of lessons (CR1h)	-.64	.60
Attention spans considered in lesson (CR4c)	-.60	.47

Table 15, continued

Variables	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
What is the efficiency of transitions? (ORT6)	-.79	.61
Teacher consistently plans enough work for students (ORT18)	-.61	.49
Teacher allows activities to continue too long (ORT20)	.64	-.65
Typical assignments are too short or easy (ORT21)	.70	-.58
Effective conduct of transitions (NRR17)	-.61	.52
Frequent problems with use of materials, supplies, and equipment in class (NRR19)	.20	-.15
Problems with students after they complete work during whole class/ seatwork activities (NRR30)	.62	-.43
Chapter 9: Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups		
Student success (CR4a)	-.55	.49
Different assignments and activities for different students (CR1g)	-.28	-.04
Needs of highest and lowest ability students are not being met (NRR21)	.44	-.52

Table 16

Summary Statistics for Treatment and Control Group Classes on Context Variables

Context Variables	Treatment				Control			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	N
Total number of students	26.02	4.73	14.00-35.00	48	24.35	4.58	12.00-32.00	46
Percent male students	48.86	10.54	20.83-75.00	47	52.76	11.21	32.00-85.00	46
Percent female students	51.14	10.54	25.00-79.17	47	47.24	11.21	15.00-68.00	46
Percent Mexican-American students	31.34	21.36	3.57-76.92	48	32.92	20.94	0.00-83.33	46
Percent Black students	12.97	13.80	0.00-58.33	48	13.53	15.41	0.00-53.85	46
Percent Asian students	.68	1.64	0.00-8.00	48	.47	1.23	0.00-4.35	46
Percent Other students	.20	.79	0.00-3.33	48	.74	2.44	0.00-13.04	46
Percent Minority students	45.19	19.96	7.14-83.87	48	47.67	16.04	16.67-90.00	46
Percent Anglo students	54.81	19.96	16.13-92.86	48	52.33	16.04	10.00-83.33	46
Average Math and Reading Percentile Scores	50.10	15.67	13.23-92.81	26[a]	50.63	13.64	16.79-68.86	26[a]

[a]Data available only in District A

Table 17

Correlations Between Context Variables

and Effectiveness Criteria

Context Variables	Off-task Unsanctioned	On task	Disruptive	Inappropriate	Task Oriented
Total number of students	-.16	.18	-.17	-.06	.19
Percent female students	.00	.25[a]	-.01	.03	-.05
Percent Mexican American students	.01	-.02	-.02	-.16	.01
Percent Black students	.00	-.01	-.01	.00	-.12
Percent Asian students	.02	.03	-.02	.08	.01
Percent Anglo students	.00	.02	.04	.19	.06
Average Math & Reading Percentile Scores	-.23	.20	-.27	-.24	.29[a]

Note: For sample size, see Table 16.

[a] $p < .05$

Appendix A

An outline of the contents of the management manual

CONTENTS

Introduction

How To Use This Manual 2

Chapter 1 — Organizing Your Room and Materials for the Beginning of School

Summary Guidelines for Organizing Room and Materials 14

Activity for Chapter 1 14

Checklist 1, Preparing the Classroom 15

Chapter 2 — Developing a Workable Set of Rules and Procedures

Definition of Terms 18

Identifying School Rules and Procedures 19

Deciding on Rules and Procedures 21

Identifying Necessary Procedures 22

Planning Your Classroom Rules 30

Summary Guidelines for Planning Rules and Procedures 32

Activities for Chapter 2 32

Case Study 33

Checklist 2, Rules and Procedures 39

Chapter 3 — Student Accountability

Major Facets of Accountability 45

Work Requirements 46

Communicating Assignments 47

Monitoring 48

Checking Work 48

Academic Feedback 49

Summary Guidelines for Student Accountability 50

Activities for Chapter 3 50

Case Studies 51

Checklist 3, Accountability 57

Chapter 4 — Consequences

Reasonable Consequences 64

Penalties 65

Consequences for Accountability Procedures 66

Positive Consequences and Incentives 66

Consequences for Rules and Procedures 67

Summary Guidelines for Consequences 70

Activities for Chapter 4 70

Case Study 73

Chapter 5 — Planning Activities for the First Week

Major Areas for Planning the First Week 76

The First Day 78

After the First Day 82

Summary Guidelines for First Week Planning 84

Activity for Chapter 5 84

Case Studies 85

Chapter 6 — Maintaining Your Management System

Monitoring Student Behavior 95

Handling Inappropriate Behavior Promptly 97

Consistent Use of Consequences 99

Special Problems 100

Summary Guidelines for Maintaining Your Management System 104

Activity for Chapter 6 104

Case Studies 105

Chapter 7 — Instructional Clarity

Illustrations of Clarity 111

Communicating Clearly 113

Summary Guidelines for Instructional Clarity 116

Activities for Chapter 7 116

Case Studies 117

Chapter 8 — Organizing Instruction

Planning Classroom Activities 123

Variations in the Activity Sequence 127

Summary Guidelines for Planning Daily Activities 128

Conducting Classroom Activities 129

Summary Guidelines for Conducting Classroom Activities 134

Activity for Chapter 8 134

Chapter 9 — Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups

Lower Ability Classes 135

Establishing and Maintaining Your Management System 137

Student Accountability 137

Planning and Conducting Instruction 138

Activity Sequences 139

Summary Guidelines for Lower Ability Classes 143

Teaching Heterogeneous Classes 143

Supplementing Whole Group Instruction 145

Small Groups 146

Guidelines for Using Small Groups Successfully 147

Summary Guidelines for Instruction in Heterogeneous Classes 151

Activities for Chapter 9 151

Case Studies 153

Appendix B

Description of the workshop activities and materials

Junior High School
Classroom Management Improvement Study (JMIS)
Beginning School Workshop
AGENDA

Time Allocation	Activity
5 minutes	Teachers complete short concerns questionnaire
20 minutes	Introductions, followed by presentation of goals and background of the study and the workshop
8 minutes	Overview of contents of teacher's manual
30 minutes	Presentation and discussions, Chapters 1-4
15 minutes	Break
20 minutes	Presentation and discussions, Chapter 5
20 minutes	Presentation and discussions, Chapter 6
15 minutes	Activity: critique of first-day scenarios
15 minutes	Closing: disussion of study procedures and schedule, answering questions, etc.

OUTLINE OF THE BEGINNING SCHOOL JMIS TEACHER WORKSHOP

AUGUST 1981

(5 min) As teachers arrive, give them the half-sheet Concerns Questionnaire and ask them to take a minute or 2 to complete it.

I. Introduction and stage setting

15 min

A. Introduce the project and study.

(Something like, "The project that you have agreed to participate in is being conducted by the Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching Project at the Research and Development Center at the University of Texas at Austin. The Research and Development Center is a federally funded research center that has been studying effective teaching for many years. For the past five years our project has been focusing on classroom management, because research done at our center and other research centers in the country showed that effective classroom management is a very important, necessary part of good teaching. Not only is classroom management clearly related to student learning gains, but also it is an area in which many teachers have concerns and want more information. I want to tell you a little more about the research background for this particular project, but first I'd like to take time for everyone to get introduced.")

B. Introductions

COET staff members introduce themselves and give some information about the part they will play in the study this year, and teachers introduce themselves and tell their subject area and grade assignment.

C. Describe the JHCOS very briefly.

1. What we set out to learn.

2. What we did---group selection and comparison.

3. What we learned---importance of the beginning of school; identification of strategies used by the effective teachers. We put what we learned that year into this manual.

D. Purposes and goals

1. Purpose of the study this year: To find out if a manual such as this can be helpful to teachers in organizing their classes, getting a good start in the school year and maintaining it throughout the year.

2. The goal of this study and the similar one we did last year at the elementary grade levels is to improve teacher education, as well as to provide validated materials for teacher in-service (most teachers tell us that they received little help in classroom management in their pre-service training).

3. We have good reason to think that the study will be very successful and that participation will be a helpful experience: CMIS and pilot results good.

7 min

E. Read the First Day Scenario.

Introduce it with the explanation that it is based on real classes taught by new teachers and that most teachers have some good ideas about what to do in class at the beginning of school but sometimes have trouble carrying them out. At the end, tell teachers that we will be coming back to this example at the end of the workshop and we would like to hear their comments then.

7 min

F. Pass out the manuals and introduce contents.

1. Note three color pages and types of contents.

2. Everyone turn to Table of Contents. State that the objective of the workshop today is to highlight those areas of the manual which will probably be most important and most useful to teachers now before school starts, but also to make teachers want to read the whole manual. For example, we won't look at Chapters 7, 8, and 9 much today although these chapters contain much information that is important and useful and that should be included in teachers' planning. At the second workshop after teachers have had a chance to read all the manual we will focus more on these other chapters. We will spend the rest of the workshop today looking at the material in the manual that pertains to three things: planning classroom procedures and rules, planning activities for the first week of school, and managing student behavior effectively.

3. Teachers will notice that there is much in the manual that is very basic. We realize that they know many of the things already. We hope they will bear with us, and take from the manual what they find to be useful for them. They may find some slightly new ways of doing things, or even some suggestions that are quite different from things they have done or assumptions they have held in the past. Many experienced teachers have told us before that it was satisfying to them that research has supported some "common sense" things that they have thought all along.

4. In order to allow some discussion as we go through the manual today, we will work in two groups for part of the rest of the

session, then we will come back together as a whole group at the end.

II. Planning classroom procedures and rules (following discussions conducted in two smaller groups with discussion leaders)

30 min A. Survey teachers to see who has their room all arranged and who has not.

Show the teachers that in Chapter 1 there are guidelines and a checklist that will help them in arranging their classroom space if they have not done so already, or that will help them in evaluating their arrangements so far.

B. Planning procedures and rules

1. Introduce this section with a reference to our research findings that show that more effective teachers are generally those who think about classroom procedures in some detail, etc.

2. Point out the main headings in the "Procedures" chapters, pp. 25-31. Then go over Checklist 2, mentioning some guidelines and suggestions as you go. Ask teachers to discuss any areas that they have had problems with, have questions about, or would like to share interesting ideas for. Then do the same thing with Accountability procedures, pp. 48-53, and Checklist 3.

3. Rules---Define rules as on page 19 and state some general guidelines like recommended number of rules and finding out about school rules (p. 20).

4. Ask teachers to quickly look over the five rules that are provided on page 32-33 as examples of common rules in junior high classes.

(1 hr 4 min elapsed) 5. Ask teachers to state rules that have worked in their classes or in other classes they have known. Discuss.

15 min (BREAK) (Leaders of the two small groups switch places)

20 min III. Activities for the First Week of School

A. Start this section by emphasizing the goals for the first week of school as on page 81.

B. Ask teachers to look at the list of first week considerations on pages 82-83. If beginning class routines did not get discussed in the procedures discussion, discuss it now. See if teachers have any ideas to share about good warm-ups or other beginning routines. Call attention to the index here where page numbers are listed for nine different examples of beginning class in this manual.

C. Ask teachers to turn to page 84 and 85, "The First Day."

Show that there are suggestions for what to do before the bell (a), how to introduce (b), and administrative tasks (c), and teaching rules and procedures (d). Show the case study on p. 35.

D. Planning a content activity for the first day

1. Call teachers attention to the remaining first day components on page 87 and through 89 sections E and F. Quickly state for them the main guidelines for choosing an initial content activity.

2. Ask teachers for suggestions of first day content activities that have worked for them or others.

E. Show case studies on pp. 93-100 that illustrate what 2 effective teachers did in the first 3 days of school.

20 min IV. Consequences and Monitoring

A. Ask teachers to read the scenario on page 101.

Note that our research findings have indicated that most junior high school students are relatively subdued and well-behaved during the first days of school, but that inappropriate behavior may begin in the second and third weeks of school or sooner if teachers do not take active steps to maintain good management.

B. State three keys to maintaining: (p. 104)

1. Talk about monitoring---go over some tips.

2. Talk about stopping inappropriate behavior.

a. Cite consistent research findings about the importance of stopping inappropriate behavior quickly.

b. Discuss guidelines about what inappropriate behavior can be ignored, page 107.

c. Go over four simple ways to handle inappropriate behavior, page 106.

3. Talk about consequences:

a. Go to "Consequences" Chapter on page 67. Explain that this chapter is near the front of the book because of its importance in planning before school.

b. Point out two important things about this chapter:

(1) Consequences includes both rewards and penalties.

(2) This chapter includes examples of common consequences, but we are not suggesting that teachers should use any particular one. Two important considerations: follow school guidelines, talk to experienced teachers on their campuses.

c. Ask teachers what deterrents and/or rewards have worked best for them or for other junior high school teachers they know.

15 min

V. Critique of first-day scenario. Pass out copies of the first day scenario which was read to teachers at the beginning of the workshop. Ask them to comment on and critique it in light of what we have gone over today.

15 min

VI. Closing

A. Restate objectives of this workshop.

1. We hope that the workshop has "inspired" them to read the whole manual as soon as possible.

2. We hope that this meeting has been helpful to them as they develop or polish up their list of procedures, rules, and consequences.

3. We hope that the workshop will help them to develop a detailed game plan for the first week of school.

B. Review what they can expect in participating in the JMIS.

1. They will have an observer in one of their classes on the first day of school and once or twice again during the first week. After the first week they will have an observer in one of their other classes also, at about one observation a week in each of the two periods through October. In January and February, 1982, observations will continue on a reduced basis, at about one in each of the two class periods every other week.

2. Observers will be unobtrusive, etc. Describe how to introduce them if they want to. They will have several different observers during the study. Observers do not know which teachers have the manual or what is in the manual.

3. Teachers will receive schedules of all the observations. Teachers should call us if there is any problem with the scheduling. Show schedule change form and explain how it will be used. (Make sure teachers have our phone numbers in writing somewhere when they leave the workshop.)

4. Describe communication with principals. Observation information is confidential.

5. We will be contacting them soon about the second workshop. We hope that they will have had a chance to read all of the manual at their leisure before the second workshop. Now ask teachers to look over the Concerns Questionnaire we asked them to complete when they arrived. Put a star by anything they feel we have not addressed today (or add more things if they wish). We will consider these things in our planning for the second workshop. Take up questionnaires.

6. Explain that there are other teachers in their school who did not get the manual yet, but who will be observed, etc.

7. We will contact them in the spring to arrange for an interview on their campus at their convenience. We will ask for feedback on manual and workshops. They will receive their honorarium shortly thereafter, in March or April.

8. Answer questions.

(2 hrs 29 min elapsed)

Name_____

Please take a few minutes to briefly answer the following question. You will be told what to do with it later on in the workshop.

What are the areas of classroom organization and management at the beginning of school about which you are most concerned or would like to know more?

(Brief concerns questionnaire completed by teachers at the beginning of the workshop.)

PROPERTY OF R&D CENTER
Do not use without permission

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
University of Texas Austin 78712

Classroom Organization and
Effective Teaching Project (512) 471-1283

NARRATIVE SYNOPSIS

First Day of School in a Seventh-Grade Class

Before the tardy bell rings, the teacher stands outside of the room, monitoring hallway traffic. Students enter the room talking loudly as they choose their seats. When the bell rings, the teacher enters the room and closes the door. She asks the class if they are all in the right room: "Is anyone not sure this is the right class?" No students respond. The teacher's name is written on the front board.

The teacher says, "All right, let's assign seats." She calls off the students' names that she has on the list, and she indicates seats in alphabetical order. Students grumble but they are orderly as they follow the teacher's directions for new seating. A student arrives late, and the teacher changes the seating of some students to retain alphabetical order. About this time, an embarrassed student approaches the teacher and admits that he seems to be in the wrong class. He leaves. Another tardy student arrives. The teacher asks this student simply to take the last seat.

The teacher leads a short discussion about why class rules are necessary. She ends the discussion with, "Even though they are necesary, I know you don't like having them, and I don't either. I wrote some of them here." The teacher has six rules listed on the blackboard:

1. No gum chewing.
2. Be in your seat when the bell rings.
3. Bring materials to class.
4. No abusive language.
5. I dismiss you, not the bell.
6. Do not touch the teacher's things.

The teacher briefly explains what each rule means. Some students call out comments or questions, which the teacher answers.

Then the teacher announces that they will fill out some information forms. Students groan. One student asks if he can sharpen his pencil. The teacher says, "Yes," and this question reminds her of a requirement she has not mentioned yet. She tells students they must always use pencil in this class. Meanwhile, about eight students have congregated at the pencil sharpener. The teacher passes out index cards and begins to dictate what students are to list on the card while several students still wait to sharpen their pencils. Her instructions are interrupted by two students who do not have pencils. The teacher gives one a pencil, and arranges for the second student to borrow a pencil from another student. Then she continues with her directions. She tells students to list their name, address, phone number, birthday, names of parents or guardians, and some other information about their home or family. The process is slow, and there is occasionally confusion. A student calls out, "This could go on and on, couldn't it?" The teacher ignores the remark. The

teacher has students pass the cards to the front of the row, but one student fails to do so. The teacher discovers this when the student waves it in the air, and takes up the missing card.

The teacher tells students to get out a sheet of paper. She begins to explain the assignment (amid some talking), which is to write an essay about what they want to learn in this class (a mathematics class). Most students settle down to listen but directions are interrupted when a student calls out, asking what heading to use on their paper. The teacher tells students to put their name, the date, and the period number at the top of their page, and then she continues with some brief directions about what to write. "What do you really want to get out of this class? Decimals?" She gives an example about the importance of decimals in buying a car. Students call out questions and requests for help with spelling to which the teacher responds. On the board, the teacher lists some words that students request. Students get to work but, because requirements for length and content are unclear, almost half the class finishes very quickly. Some students begin to talk and wander around while the teacher is circulating trying to help those students who are continuing to work on the task.

After about 6 minutes, the teacher stops everyone and has students trade papers. She asks some students to read what others have written. This activity does not work as the teacher had planned. Students are not attentive, and some ridicule what others have written. The teacher promises that she will teach them anything they want to learn this year, adding that they will be learning decimals and place values. Loud groans greet this remark. The teacher ignores the groans and has students pass their essays forward. There is some loud talk and wandering while the class waits for public address announcements to come on. The teacher tries to learn students' names and get acquainted with individuals in the class. When the announcements come on, students are quiet at first and then one student walks up to the teacher to ask a question. The teacher quickly answers the student's question, but, seeing that other students are beginning to talk and that another girl is approaching her desk, the teacher interrupts announcements to tell students that she expects them to be quiet and to listen during announcements.

When the public address announcements are over, the teacher tells students what to expect on the following day and practices learning more of their names. The bell rings, and the students rush for the door as the teacher talks with one student who has come up to her desk with a question.

Junior High School
Classroom Management Improvement Study (JMIS)
Booster Workshop Agenda

Time Allocation	Activity
	Get acquainted time. Rolls, coffee, etc.
15 minutes	Introduction. Welcome and thanks for participation. Explanation of the purposes of the morning workshop. Schedule of activities.
50 minutes	Small group discussions of problem case studies a. Behavior b. Instruction
15 minutes	Break
50 minutes	Continuation of small group discussions of problem case studies, switching leaders and topics.
10 minutes	Wrap-up discussion.
30 minutes	Teachers complete questionnaires.

Junior High School Management Improvement Study (JMIS)

Outline of Booster Workshop

I. Introductory remarks

A. Objectives of the workshop

Thank you for coming and for continuing participation and toleration of the observers in your classroom. Our observers have expressed admiration and enthusiasm for what they are seeing in classes, and we have learned a great deal about different subject area settings. We realize that you have may have questions or comments about observations or other aspects of the project at this point, and we have set aside some time at the end of the morning to address these.

Our main objective today is to examine and discuss the contents of the chapters of the manual that were not discussed much in the workshop before school began. But today, rather than just look at the manual and talk about it as we did in the earlier meeting, we would like to discuss the contents as they relate to some problems or situations that observations have shown to be common in classes in the project this year. In doing so, we hope that you will share your perspectives and ideas. Observations have shown not only that the problems that will discuss today are prevalent, but also that many of you are dealing with these problems in a variety of good ways.

B. Plan for the session

Each of you has a folder with some materials that we will use today. During most of the morning we will meet in small groups to talk about these short problem scenarios or case studies. One set focuses mainly on behavior problems, and the other set focuses mainly on instructional problems, although of course there is a great deal of

overlap. Each group will have a group leader, and after the break we will switch groups. During the last 30 minutes of the workshop, we will ask you to fill out the questionnaire that is in your packet.

II. Small group discussions

During the first 50 minutes small group discussion, one leader will conduct discussions of four specific problems in the area of behavior management: transitions, problem students, improving classroom behavior, and student behavior in a low ability class. Another leader will conduct discussion of four instructional organizational problems: heterogeneous classes, teaching low ability classes, missingl assignments, and improving instructional clarity.

After a 15-minute break, leaders will switch groups to talk about a second second set of problems.

III. Wrap up discussion and project business

A. Wrap up of activities

Summarize a few good ideas heard in small groups, if possible. We hope you have received some additional ideas you can use in your classrooms.

B. Project business

1. Thanks for calling us with changes in your schedules or unusual circumstances in your classes. So far very little trouble in scheduling has been experienced, and we hope it has not caused any problems for you.

2. Observations for the remainder of the study will be scheduled in the same two classes once a week until October 16. There may be some makeup observations, but they will be completed

by the end of October. During January and February, you can expect four observations of each class, approximately one every week. We will send you the schedule for all January and February observations in December.

3. (District A only) In late February we will be asking you for a list of names of students in the two classes we observed. We will not use the names ourselves; they will be given to the district research office to access achievement scores on these students. The research office will then give us a list of scores without student names. These data will be used to identify classes with wide ranges of ability or different levels of ability, so that we can study management problems that might be associated with these different classes.

4. After the end of observations, teachers will be contacted for an interview of about 3/4 to 1 hour. They will receive more correspondence about this interview and about paperwork for their honorarium later.

5. Questionnaire. The questionnaire in your folder contains descriptions of some problems that are similar to those we talked about in small groups today. We are very interested in knowing what you would do in the circumstances described. Therefore, we would prefer that you think about the questions and answer them in the remaining time in this session without looking at your manual or notes from today. Try to decide what you would do in your circumstances.

6. Questions from teachers.

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching Project
University of Texas Austin 78712
(512) 471-1283

PROBLEM: TRANSITIONS

Mr. Miller feels that too much time is wasted in his 7th grade class while students get settled after class changes, get supplies ready, or change from one activity to another. While the teacher deals with students' problems, makeup work, or questions at the beginning of class, students talk and begin to play around or wander. Then it takes some time to get their attention and get class started. Also, in activity changes during the class period, students sometimes delay activities while they sharpen pencils or borrow supplies. Trading papers to check work in class usually results in some confusion or hassle.

Mr. Miller has already spoken with his class about the problem, and has reminded them of the rules for sharpening pencils immediately upon arrival and taking seats before the bell. He tries to enforce these two rules, but he is also required to monitor the hall. What else can he do to cut down on wasted time?

Where to Look in the Manual

Transitions: pp. 144-145
Transition Problems and Suggestions: pp. 146-147
Monitoring: pp. 103-105
Stopping Inappropriate Behavior: pp. 105-106
Beginning Class Routines: p. 138

Some Specific Suggestions

Don't do anything that interferes with your ability to monitor during these class changes. Stand near the door at the front of the room. Be visible.

Use established routines as much as possible for beginning and ending lessons, passing and collecting papers or supplies, and exchanging papers to grade. Monitor to be sure students follow established routines.

Use an academic warmup as part of your beginning class routine. Warmups consist of short written assignements or review materials, or other relatively easy tasks, such as math drills, review problems, composition practice, grammar drills, scrambled sentences to copy and decode, sentences or verses to copy and complete, etc. Usually these are put on a chalkboard or an overhead transparency, and students must complete the task in a set period of time from the beginning of class (usually 5 minutes or less). Warmup activities MUST be checked and graded regularly.

Teach students exactly what behaviors you expect during transitions: voice level, pencil sharpener, procedures for passing papers, ready signals.

Have all teacher materials ready before transitions.

Don't allow "come ups" during transitions.

Begin seatwork together as a class. Do the first problem together.

Monitor at the beginning of seatwork assignments to be sure everyone gets a good start.

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
University of Texas Austin 78712

Classroom Organization and
Effective Teaching Project (512) 471-1283

PROBLEM: "PROBLEM" STUDENTS

Ms. Jones is especially concerned about two students. Greg does very little work, even when the teacher helps him get started and sees that he understands how to proceed. Greg tends to spend most of his time watching other students. He just shuffles his paper when told to get to work and shrugs when asked where his work is when it is due. Joe, on the other hand, manages to get most of his work done, but in the process he is constantly disruptive. He flirts and teases the girls sitting around him, keeping them constantly giggling and competing for his attention. Joe makes wisecracks in response to almost everything Ms. Jones says. When confronted by her, he grins charmingly and responds with exaggerated courtesy, much to the delight of the rest of the class.

In her efforts to improve the boys' behavior, Ms. Jones has talked privately with both of them. She moved Greg's desk closer to her own, to make it easier to watch him and keep him on task. She has moved Joe's desk away from his friends' several times, but he seems able to stir up excitement wherever he sits. Despite Ms. Jones' efforts, these two students continue to pose particular problems. What else can she do?

Where to Look in the Manual

Maintaining your management system: pp. 101 - 108
Chronic work avoidance: pp. 109 - 110
Habitual rule-breaking: pp. 110 - 111

Some Specific Suggestions

Greg

1. Seat Greg where he can be monitored easily.

2. Whenever possible, break up the assignments into parts for Greg to prevent the possibility of his feeling overwhelmed. Have him show you two or three completed problems after 5 minutes, two or three after the next 5 minutes, and so on. At first, the teacher should initiate these checks until Greg assumes the responsibility. During the year, gradually increase the number of problems required and the length of time between checks. Offer a bonus of 5 minutes of free time at the end of the period when he gets the required number of problems completed up to that point.

3. Tell Greg that for each time you notice that he is working steadily without your prodding, he will earn 1/2 minute free time at the end of the period to sit quietly or do any activity you have provided for students who finish their work early. Each time you do see him working, record the time which he has earned and tell him how much he has up to that point. (This probably should not exceed 4 to 5 minutes.) Be sure to notify him in time for him to enjoy his earned free time.

Joe

1. Seat Joe completely away from students, with his face to the wall or behind a screen. After a week, if his behavior has improved, work out a system in which he can earn his way back to the class with one full period of completely appropriate behavior; let him remain with the class only so long as his behavior is completely appropriate.

2. Set specific consequences for his turning around, speaking out without permission, and making inappropriate comments; follow through in carrying these out consistently.

3. Consequences for his breaking the rules may include such things as having to wait in his seat 1 minute after the class leaves for the next period, sitting in the hall to do his work, or a certain number of demerits that result in detention or being sent to the office.

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
University of Texas Austin 78712

Classroom Organization and
Effective Teaching Project (512) 471-1283

PROBLEM: IMPROVING CLASS BEHAVIOR

Ms. Johnson is concerned because no matter how hard she tries to follow through with classroom behavior requirements, her students continue to talk loudly, call out, leave their seats, argue with their neighbors, and write notes. Within one class period, she wrote seven students' names on the board for talking, after having warned them several times to stop; she moved one boy to a seat by her desk for clowning around and making other students giggle; she warned one girl twice about giving answers to other students; and she threatened to send two boys to the office for wandering around the room, bothering other students. She decided that she needed to stop giving so many warnings before following through on consequences. What else would you suggest that Ms. Johnson do?

Where to Look in the Manual

Developing a Workable Set of Rules and Procedures: pp. 27, II.1
pp. 28, II.6

Consequences: pp. 67 - 75

Monitoring Student Behavior: pp. 103 - 105

Handling Inappropriate Behavior Promptly: pp. 105 - 108

Consistent Use of Consequences: pp. 108 - 109

Some Specific Suggestions

Monitor the class constantly, with the goal of anticipating and preventing misbehavior before it occurs.

Give no more than one warning before following through with the stated consequences.

Make sure that students have enough work to do, that they understand exactly what to do and can do it, and that they know what specific things they are to do after they finish their work.

Structure some class time for student discussion.

Whenever possible, statements about behavior should be work-related and positively stated:

> "You need to be working Problems 6 though 15. That involves no talking."
>
> "After you have turned in your assignment, you may read your library book or work on an assignment from another class."
>
> "If you are having problems with this assignment, raise your hand and I'll come to your desk."

Decide what minor inappropriate student behavior should be ignored.

Be sure that stated consequences are appropriate to the behavior and that you can and will carry them out consistently. Include positive consequences for appropriate behavior in your list of specific consequences.

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
University of Texas Austin 78712

Classroom Organization and
Effective Teaching Project (512) 471-1283

PROBLEM: STUDENT BEHAVIOR IN A LOW ABILITY CLASS

Mr. Oliver is concerned about student behavior in his lower ability class. Several students are always late coming in. Others frequently forget their books, paper, pencils, assignments, etc. During content presentations, students call out answers or comments, some leave their seats to throw away paper or sharpen their pencils, and there is frequently chatting and note writing. During seatwork assignments, students work the first problem or two while teacher is watching, but then turn to their neighbors as soon as he turns his back to work with individual students. He tried to establish order by using a "fine" system, in which students had to write out and turn in definitions or problems if they were caught in inappropriate behavior. This system had worked well with his average classes, but in his low class he found he was constantly handing out fines, and was unable to keep track of whether they were turned in. What other ideas could Mr. Oliver try?

Where to Look in the Manual

Lower Ability Groups: pp. 151-159
Maintaining Your Management System: p. 103-112
Developing a Workable Set of Rules and Procedures: p. 2-34
Work Requirements: p. 49, d-h
Communicating Assignments: pp. 50-51
Consequences: p. 67-80

Some Specific Suggestions

Reward compliance with procedures by awarding points toward grades. Give students points, checks, or stars daily for having appropriate materials, being in their seats ready to work when the bell rings, and staying on task throughout the period.

Have students keep a record of materials and assignments they will need to bring to class. Stand at the door during the passing period and remind students of what they will need for class. Post what books and matertials will be needed beside or above the door so that students can see it while walking in the hall.

Have students bring pencils and paper to leave in your clasroom so that they will always be available. Have students label the writing implements and keep the paper in a folder with their name and class period.

Keep a supply of pens or pencils on hand for emergency loans, but impose some penalty (demerits, fines, or detentions) when students have to borrow supplies.

Before content presentations, remind students that you will call on students to answer and that you will not accept call outs except when you signal it. One signal you could use is to touch your ear for an oral response. Another signal you could use is to say the word, "Class." A signal must be taught to students.

Remind students that you will not allow anyone out of his/her seat without permission; you will allow time for throwing away paper or pencil sharpening after the presentation.

Stop inappropriate behavior during presentations by reminding students of the procedure or rule. If the behavior persists, impose a penalty.

Circulate during content presentations and seatwork activities. Try to walk by every student in the room. Look at every student's paper to be sure s/he is working on the right assignment and doing it correctly. Do not stay too long with any one student. If a student needs additional help, have him/her come with you to a table or desk where you can see all of the students in the classroom. Frequent circulating should tend to discourage note writers and talkers.

Keep a clipboard with you at all times with student's names entered on a seating chart. It will be easy to glance at the chart to make a mark when a demerit or fine is assigned for inappropriate behavior by a student. The location on the chart will ease the problems of trying to remember names. If the marks are made in pencil, they can be erased after the tally is transferred to a grade book or the fines are counted.

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
University of Texas Austin 78712
Classroom Organization and
Effective Teaching Project (512) 471-1283

PROBLEM: HETEROGENEOUS CLASSES

Never before has Ms. Rogers had to deal with students of such different entering achievement levels in her 7th grade class. She feels frustrated in her efforts to provide instruction at appropriate levels for some students several years below grade level and others above grade level. The brightest students finish seatwork way ahead of the rest of the class, while the slowest students seldom successfully complete an assignment.

So far Ms. Rogers has tried two things. She decided to provide extra credit activities for students who finish work early, and she began to help slower students individually more often during class and after school. Both of these steps seem to help, although each also created some management problems. What additional things might Ms. Rogers do.?

Where to Look in the Manual

Teaching Heterogeneous Classes: pp. 159-167
Adjusting Whole Group Activities: pp. 160-162
Using Small Group Instruction: pp. 163-166
pp. 171-172 (Case Study)
Student Accountability for Work: pp. 47-65

Some Specific Suggestions

If you have one or two students who are especially likely to have trouble with whole class assignments, place these students where you can easily keep an eye on them during instruction and seatwork. As soon as you have given seatwork instructions to the whole class and you have monitored to be sure they have begun work, check with the slower student(s) privately to go over instructions again or modify the assignment, as needed. If there are more than two such students, treat them as a small group.

Enrichment or extra credit materials for students who finish class work early should be work-related activities that will not distract other students. Set up a system for giving feedback, credit, or recognition for completion of enrichment activities.

Be sure to involve all students in the class when leading a discussion or recitation session. Use some system to be sure each student has opportunities to participate frequently.

Include some activities that can be done together as a whole class but at different levels by different students, e.g., Common Factors Drill, writing assignments.

If the above suggestions are not sufficient for a given class, use small group instruction for part of your course work. Plan and teach procedures for group work carefully.

If you establish two or three work groups in a class, try to plan some seatwork assignments so that there is a basic assignment that all students do, then additional activities at appropriate levels for each group.

When using differentiated assignments, make adjustments in your grading system so that lower ability students can get satisfactory grades.

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
University of Texas Austin 78712

Classroom Organization and
Effective Teaching Project (512) 471-1283

PROBLEM: TEACHING LOW-ABILITY CLASS

Sometimes Ms. Porter feels that the students in her low-ability second period class are either unwilling or unable to learn anything. Many seem apathetic; they won't even try. Most have short attention spans and seem to require constant individual assistance.

At the beginning of the year, Ms. Porter assumed that she would teach her low-ability section much as she would the other classes, except for using a slower pace, with more practice and drill for the students in the lower-ability section. After several weeks of school, she realized other adjustments would have to be made as well. She began showing students exactly what to write down for notes during teacher presentations, and she began asking more frequent, simple review questions in class to hold students' attention and help them learn. These measures helped, but many students still don't complete their work successfully. What are some other adjustments Ms. Porter should make in her low-ability section?

Where to Look in the Manual

Lower Ability Groups: pp. 151 - 158
Case Study: pp. 169 - 170
Pacing: pp. 148 - 149
Examples of Incentives and Rewards: pp. 79 - 80

Some Specific Suggestions

Spend more time actively teaching the class as a whole, and less time helping students individually during seatwork.

Get frequent work samples, written as well as oral, from students in lower-ability classes.

Use systematic turns to insure frequent oral participation from all students.

Provide as much structure for classwork and homework as possible. Begin all assignments in class as a group. Use dittos or worksheets that lead students through tasks in a step-by-step fashion with frequent, short, written responses.

Break class periods up into a series of short tasks, with some accountability for each.

Emphasize daily grades, and provide frequent feedback to students about their daily grades.

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
University of Texas Austin 78712

Classroom Organization and
Effective Teaching Project (512) 471-1283

PROBLEM: MISSING ASSIGNMENTS

At the beginning of the year, students in Mr. Hope's classes almost always completed assignments promptly. However, after the first few weeks of school, incomplete and missing assignments began to occur with increasing regularity. When Mr. Hope asked why they did not complete assignments, some students claimed they did not know what they were supposed to do. Others complained that when they worked at home, they couldn't remember what to do. This surprised Mr. Hope because students did not seem confused nor did they ask questions when he gave the assignments in class.

In an effort to encourage more diligent behavior, Mr. Hope reminded his classes that each homework assignment was to be kept in a notebook. This was to be turned in at the end of the grading period, and the notebook would receive a lower grade if assignments were missing. He also started listing assignments on the board to help students remember them.

These measures seemed to help for a few days; however, the rate of incomplete or missing assignments soon escalated.

What are some other ideas this teacher might consider trying in order to improve student performance?

Where to Look in the Manual

Student Accountability: pp. 48 - 53
Consequences for Accountability Procedures: pp. 71 - 72
Communicating clearly: pp. 126 - 128

Some Specific Suggestions

Wait for all students' attention before beginning to give instructions.

After giving instructions, ask a student (one who may need help) to repeat the instructions.

Quiz the class about what they are to do, rather than only inviting questions.

Immediately after giving instructions to the whole class, go over them with the slower students, either individually or (if there are more than two) in a small group.

Watch all students' faces carefully while you give directions. Look for signs of confusion, inattention.

Do a few problems (questions) with the class. Show them exactly how their papers should look. (An overhead projector works well for this.)

While you watch the class, have everyone head their papers and do one or two problems. Announce the answer(s). Ask for a show of hands. Work the problem(s) on the board quickly.

Don't go to your desk. Circulate and look at every student's paper.

For long-term assignments, such as notebooks, inspect them frequently. This can be done while you monitor seatwork. Also, post a list of required parts, sections, steps, and so on, for such assignments.

When a student begins to skip assignments, call his/her home and enlist help from the parent(s).

Be sure to leave enough time in class for students to begin and to complete part of each assignment before taking it home. Then you'll be able to note immediately and to correct widespread confusion.

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
University of Texas Austin 78712

Classroom Organization and
Effective Teaching Project (512) 471-1283

PROBLEM: IMPROVING INSTRUCTIONAL CLARITY

In Ms. Carpenter's class there almost always seems to be some students who don't understand presentations or assignments and who need a lot of reexplanation. While she is lecturing, she is continually asked a lot of questions about what students should write in their notes. When an in-class assignment is made, she finds herself answering a lot of questions about information she has just covered in the lecture. Sometimes she has to reexplain parts of the lesson to the whole class. Always there are some students who finish very quickly, others who seem to dawdle, and some who simply have trouble finishing the assignment. As a result, there is usually not enough time to complete the assignment and check it before the end of the period. In an attempt to avoid the problems associated with note taking, she decides to write important information on the chalkboard during the lecture. What else can Ms. Carpenter do?

Where to Look in the Manual

Illustrations of Clear and Unclear Instruction: pp. 123-124
Step-by-Step Guidelines for Clarity: pp. 126-128
Monitoring: p. 51
Organizing Instruction: p. 137-143
Pacing: pp. 148-149
Teaching Heterogeneous Classes: pp. 159-167

Some Specific Suggestions

While lecturing, let students know what they are expected to write in their notes by underlining important points as they are written on the chalkboard, or by listing them on an overhead projector transparency. Another way of structuring their note taking would be to give students an outline of important areas, with space for them to take additional notes.

Be sure that overhead projector transparencies can be seen by every student in the room. Standard typewriter print cannot be read from the back of the room.

At the end of presentations, always restate or quiz students on important points. Be sure students know what the main points, or objectives, of the lesson are.

During content development, obtain frequent work samples, e.g., have students do problems, sentences, or answer questions. Circulate during these times, looking for areas of confusion, common problems which arise, and students who are not participating. Based on the feedback from these samples, adjust instruction by either slowing down or speeding up the presentation or by repeating areas where there is confusion. If work samples are used throughout the presentation, there may not be a need for an in-class assignment everyday.

Reconsider the amount of information being presented in the class. Perhaps it would be better to present less information so that there will be sufficient time to check an in-class assignment prior to turning students loose on a homework assignment.

Be sure complex lessons are broken down into smaller, easier to understand steps or parts.

If it becomes apparent during the work samples that some students still do not understand, have them join you in a small group after the general presentation. In this group you can review the points of the lesson and answer their questions. If it's only one or two students, seat them close to the front where you can get to them easily during or after a presentation to check how well they are doing.

Circulate while students are doing seatwork assignments. Check to be sure they are working on the assignment, they are doing the assignment correctly, and they are using their time wisely.

Tell students how long the assignment should take. Warn them when there is about one minute until time to check it.

Appendix C

Management manual questionnaire

Your comments about the manual, Organizing and Managing the Junior High Classroom, will be greatly appreciated. We will use this information to revise the manual to make it more useful for teachers in the future. Please look through each part of the manual and, for each chapter, circle the number of the appropriate answer below. (Please circle only 1 number for each chapter.)

How Useful Did You Find the Suggestions in Each Section?

	Not useful; not appropriate or practical for my class.	Slightly useful. I used one or two suggestions.	Moderately useful. Used some of the suggestions.	Useful and helpful. I used many of the suggestions.	Very helpful and useful. Having this material made a positive difference in my class.
Chapter 1 Organizing for the Beginning of School	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 2 Developing Rules and Procedures	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 3 Student Accountability	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 4 Consequences	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 5 Planning Activities for First Week	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 6 Maintaining Your Management System	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 7 Instructional Clarity	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 8 Organizing Instruction	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 9 Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups	1	2	3	4	5

How Much Did You Read or Study the Contents of Each Section?

	None, or very little.	Had time for only a quick overview of all or most of it.	Read it carefully once. Did at least some of activities.	Read it more than once. Did most activities.	Studied this part carefully. Did activities. Reviewed it after school started.
Chapter 1 Organizing for the Beginning of School	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 2 Developing Rules and Procedures	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 3 Student Accountability	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 4 Consequences	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 5 Planning Activities for First Week	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 6 Maintaining Your Management System	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 7 Instructional Clarity	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 8 Organizing Instruction	1	2	3	4	5
Chapter 9 Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups	1	2	3	4	5

Additional Comments:

C-2

At the beginning of the school year you received a manual and attended one workshop before school started and another after several weeks of school. We are interested in your opinion of how beneficial each of these three parts of the program was to you. Please indicate below, using the following scale:

5 Extremely helpful and beneficial.
4 Helpful and beneficial.
3 Moderately or somewhat beneficial or helpful.
2 Slightly beneficial or helpful.
1 Not at all beneficial or helpful.

Circle one number for each component:

5	4	3	2	1	The manual, Organizing and Managing the Junior High Classroom
5	4	3	2	1	The workshop in August before the beginning of school
5	4	3	2	1	The workshop on a Saturday after 3 weeks of school

Appendix D

Instructions for preparing a Narrative Record

PROPERTY OF R&D CENTER
Do not use without permission

JMIS

GUIDELINES FOR JMIS CLASSROOM ACTIVITY RECORD

The purpose of the Classroom Activity Record (CAR) is to provide a record of class time use, instructional activities, and important aspects of class behavior during each observed class meeting. Each page of the Classroom Activity Record consists of: (1) an ID field, (2) four columns for coding activities, recording elapsed time in each activity, noting SERs, and recording time points, and (3) space for recording descriptive notes of activities and behavior.

Completing the ID Field

The ID field at the top of the Classroom Activity Record should correspond exactly to that on the Student Engagement Rating form for the same observation. Complete Teacher Number, School Number, Subject Number, and Observer Number blanks using the code numbers that have been supplied to observers. In the Period Number blank, indicate which of the teacher's class sections was observed. The Date should be the date the observation was made. In the Number of Students blank, the observer should record the total number of students in attendance in class during the observation. This number should include late arrivals and early departures. In the Number of Adults blank, record the number of adults simultaneously instructing or in charge of students for any major part of the class. For example, if both the teacher and an aide or Student Teacher are interacting with, instructing, or actively monitoring students for all or part of the class period, the number of adults recorded would be "2." If the teacher is in charge of the class for half of the period, however, and then leaves and another adult is in charge of the class for the rest of the period, the Number of Adults

would still be "1." In the Grade blank, record the official grade level of the class.

Activity Codes and # Minutes

There are thirteen categories of classroom activities. These are the same categories used for SERs. Whenever an activity begins, the appropriate code should be noted in the Activity Code column. The beginning time should be noted in the Time Points column. When the activity category changes again, the new Activity Code and Time Point should be noted and the elapsed time spent in the first activity should be noted in the # Minutes column immediately beside the first Activity Code and Time Point notation. No activity should be recorded until the class actually begins or the bell rings to signal the official beginning of the class. At the end of the class, write "bell" or "dismissal" in the Activity Code column to indicate the end of the final activity. Record the time of this ending in the Time Points column. NOTE: Activity Code and # Minutes columns can be completed after the fact, using Time Point notations and Descriptive Notes. Activity Codes are described below.

Description of Activity Code Categories

Code No.	Explanation
1	Content Development: Teacher presentation of content. Includes lecture, demonstration, explanation of academic content. May also include some questioning or comments from students, but the main function of this activity is informing students, introducing new material, or reviewing previously introduced material. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.

Code No.	Explanation
2	Content Development: Recitation/Discussion. Includes questioning of students by the teacher. The function of this activity is to provide students practice of skills or review of material. This category might also include short written tasks, as when teachers ask students to work one problem at their desks to assess understanding during a content development activity. To be included in "Recitation/Discussion," written tasks or other seatwork must last less than 3 minutes. This code could also include a content-oriented game or board work actively involving most of the class. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in On-task, Academic categories.
3	Individual Seatwork. Students are working at desks individually. This code includes warm-up activities that are content-centered. Brief directions for seatwork or short teacher interruptions of seatwork to explain or clarify directions should be left in seatwork time unless they last more than 1 minute. If during a content development activity the teacher assigns a written task, the written task should be coded as "Seatwork" if it lasts 3 minutes or longer. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.
4	Tests. Anything called a test, quiz, readiness test, or assessment. Students work independently. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.
5	Pairs or Group Seatwork. Group projects, experiments, small group tasks. Teacher circulates or monitors from desk. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.
6	Student Presentation. One or several students present to the class for more than 1 minute. The presentation is planned ahead of time rather than in response to a direct teacher question as in recitation. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.

Code No.	Explanation
7	Small Group Instruction. Teacher works with a group of students (3 or more) for more than 1 minute while the rest of the class is in seatwork. This category takes priority over all others, e.g., don't code seatwork for the other students during this period. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.
8	Procedural/Behavioral Presentation. The teacher presents or reviews classroom procedures or rules. This code should be used any time the teacher institutes and explains classroom procedures or rules governing student behavior. It should also be used when the teacher gives the class extensive feedback on their behavior, or discusses problems relating to student behavior in class, or students' following of classroom procedures. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Procedural categories.
9	Procedural/Administrative Routines. This code can include roll call, announcements, opening or closing routines (unless academic content is involved), giving directions for assignments (if over 1 minute), discussions of grades, distributing graded papers, recording grades in class, and changing seating. These activities must involve most of the students. For example, if roll call or distributing graded papers involves only the teacher and one or two students, while most of the students are doing seatwork, the "Individual Seatwork" code (3) should be used. Students engaged in this category should be counted in the On-task, Procedural categories.
10	Checking. Going over homework problems, a quiz, or assignment for the purpose of checking/grading it in class. Little or no teacher explanation or review is entailed. The teacher or students announce answers or write them on the board or overhead transparency. Students engaged in this category should be counted in the On-task, Procedural categories.

Code No.	Explanation
11	Transitions. Activities entailed in changing from one activity to another. Includes getting supplies, passing papers, waiting for everyone to get ready, quiet, or find the place. Activity codes for "Transitions" should not be noted in the Classroom Activity Record when the transition lasts less than 1 minute. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Procedural categories.
12	Non-academic Activity. Games, discussions, TV, not related to content of the class. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the Off-task, Sanctioned category.
13	Dead Time. Two-thirds or more of the class have no assigned task; students are just waiting. Students falling into this category should be counted in the Dead Time category.

Noting SERs

Whenever a Student Engagement Rating is completed, record the number of the SER in the SERs column directly opposite the time notation and corresponding Descriptive Notes.

Noting Time Points

Observer should record times in the Time Points column as frequently as possible. At a minimum, times should be noted to correspond to every SER and Activity Code change. In addition, times should be noted for changes of topic, changes of instructional groupings, and major changes of teacher activities during students' seatwork.

Descriptive Notes

The Descriptive Notes should describe generally what the teacher is doing and what the students are doing, the general topic of study and topic changes, and levels of student cooperation, participation, and

extent of work avoidance. If small group instruction is used, the number, size, and activities of the different groups should be briefly described. The notes should have a whole-class focus, that is, they should describe activities of the class as a whole rather than providing details about only one or several students. However, to the extent that time allows, the observer should describe problems, sources of problems, or outstanding teacher or student behaviors that would markedly affect any of the Component Ratings. For example, instances of teachers monitoring student work or behavior, inconsistent behavior management, giving academic feedback, or rewarding students for academic performance should be described. Studying the guidelines for Component Ratings will help increase awareness of what events should be described. A brief description of the general classroom appearance and arrangement (teacher's desk, students' desks, posting of rules and assignments) is desirable. The observer should not try to describe the classroom in great detail or record all interactions verbatim. Rather, the objective of the descriptive notes is to produce a coherent and readable record of major classroom activities.

In making the Descriptive Notes the abbreviations listed below may be used. Because readability is of first importance, other abbreviations or shorthand devices should not be used unless they are defined in the notes.

T	Teacher	OP	Overhead projector
S	Student	B	Boy
Ss	Students	G	Girl
bb	Bulletin board	=	Equals
cb	Chalk board	~	About, approximately
w/	With	hw	Homework
#	Number	bk	Book
Q	Question	assgn	Assignment
PA	Public address (announcement)	info	Information

Checking the Classroom Activity Record

Before turning in the Classroom Activity Record for an observation (along with the SERs and Component Ratings) CHECK IT CAREFULLY for accuracy, completeness, and readability. Clean it up, add information, or make clarifying notes as needed. The following steps should be followed in checking every Classroom Activity Record before it is turned in:

1. Check the ID field on every page to be sure that all blanks are complete and that the ID fields on all of the pages are uniform.
2. Make sure you have not left off any Activity Codes and that the codes used are accurate for the activities described in the notes.
3. The number of minutes beside each Activity Code must equal the difference between the beginning time for that activity and the beginning time noted for the next Activity Code in the column.
4. Be sure all SERs are noted.
5. Make sure that for each coded activity the Descriptive Notes indicate what the students are actually doing and the location and activities of the teacher.
6. Check to see that the ending of the last activity is indicated by the word "bell" or (in cases in which activities continue and class is not dismissed until after the bell) "dismiss" in the Activity Code column.
7. Be sure ending time is noted in the Time Points column.

JMIS

JMIS Classroom Activity Record

PROPERTY OF R&D CENTER
Do not use without permission

Teacher # 02 Period # 3 School # 06 Subject # 2 Date 5-12-81

# of SS 15 # Adults 1 Grade 8 Observer # 11 Page 1 of 5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Activity Code	# Min	SERs	Time Points	Descriptive Notes
			10:46	Before bell, T stands outside door, directing traffic and talking in a cheerful manner.
13	2		1047	Bell rings. T loudly announces she will return in a minute. Must check other T's class. Leaves. 16 Ss in room. Many stand, chat. No assignment given or on board.
11	4		1049	T returns, calls Ss by name, telling them to get in their assigned seats. All are seated by 1050. T tells them to get out homework for checking. Lots of student talk. T calls Eric's name several times. She stands at front of room near her desk, giving directions for passing papers (Students are scattered because of many absentees today). T reprimands and warns Joe for talking. Moderate level of talk as students exchange papers. T begins calling answers for checking at 1053. Ss listen, check, are quiet. At least 4 Ss have no paper, idle. Several request repeats, raising hands.
		1	1052	
10	4		1053	
9	2		1057	At end, callouts and some talk. T tells how much to take off.
			D-8	Use to help several computer questions

JMIS Classroom Activity Record

Do not use without permission

Teacher #_____ Period #_____ School #_____ Subject #_____ Date_____

# of SS_____ # Adults_____ Grade_____ Observer #____ Page___ of ___

Activity Code	# Min	SERs	Time Points	Descriptive Notes
				1.
				2.
				3.
				4.
				5.
				6.
				7.
				8.
				9.
				10.
				11.
				12.
				13.
				14.
				15.
				16.
				17.
				18.
				19.
				20.
				21.
				22.
				23.
				24.
				25.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix E

Training manual for the Student Engagement Rate form

PROPERTY OF R&D CENTER
Do not use without permission

JMIS

Guidelines for Using JMIS Student Engagement Ratings

At 10-minute intervals, the observer should complete a Student Engagement Rating (SER). This consists of two kinds of information about the classroom context at the time, a rating of student success, and a count of students who can be classified in each of eight different categories of engagement. The observer should use the sequence of Random Numbers (at the end of these SER Guidelines) to determine when, during the first 5 minutes of class, the first r ting should be made, and then maintain a 10-minute interval between all subsequent ratings.

Completing the ID Field

The ID field at the top of the Student Engagement Rating form should correspond exactly to that on the Classroom Activity Record for the same observation. Complete Teacher Number, School Number, Subject Number, and Observer Number blanks using the code numbers that have been supplied to observers. In the Period Number blank, indicate which of the teacher's class sections was observed. The Date should be the date the observation was made. In the Number of Students blank, the observer should record the total number of students in attendance in class during the observation. This number should include late arrivals and early departures. The number of students used for this blank should match that used for number of students on the ID field of the Classroom Activity Record and Component Rating form. In the Number of Adults blank, record the number of adults simultaneously instructing or in charge of students for any major part of the class. For example, if both the teacher and an aide or Student Teacher are interacting with, instructing, or actively monitoring students for all or part of the

class period, the Number of Adults recorded would be "2." If the teacher is in charge of the class for half of the period, however, and then leaves, and another adult is in charge of the class for the rest of the period, the Number of Adults would still be "1." In the Grade blank, record the official grade level of the class.

Describing Classroom Context

In order to provide information about the context in which the Engagement Rating was taken, the observer should note the time, code the activity of the classroom, record the number of students in the classroom at the time the rating was taken, and rate the level of student success in activities prior to the rating.

Classroom Activity Code. There are 13 codes to describe classroom activities. These indicate what most of the students in the room are doing at the moment that the SER is taken and, in most cases, what the teacher is doing. They also give information about how the class is organized for instruction. For example, Codes 1, 2, 8, 10, and 6 describe whole-class, teacher-led activities; Codes 3 and 4 indicate that students are working independently; and Codes 5 and 7 indicate use of group work. Activities 9, 11, 12, and 13 may assume a variety of organizational patterns (or none). The JMIS Activity Codes are described below. They are identical to the codes used in the JMIS Classroom Activity Record.

Code No.	Explanation
1	Content Development: Teacher presentation of content. Includes lecture, demonstration, explanation of academic content. May also include some questioning or comments from students, but the main function of this activity is informing students, introducing new material, or reviewing previously introduced material. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task Academic categories.
2	Content Development: Recitation/Discussion. Includes questioning of students by the teacher. The function of this activity is to provide students practice of skills or review of material. This category might also include short written tasks, as when teachers ask students to work one problem at their desks to assess understanding during a content development activity. To be included in "Recitation/Discussion" written tasks or other seatwork must last less than 3 minutes. This code could also include a content oriented game or board work actively involving most of the class. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.
3	Individual Seatwork. Students are working at desks individually. This code includes warm-up activities that are content-centered. Brief directions for seatwork or short teacher interruptions of seatwork to explain or clarify directions should be left in seatwork time unless they last more than 1 minute. If during a content development activity the teacher assigns a written task, the written task should be coded as "Seatwork" if it lasts 3 minutes or longer. Students engaged in the activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.
4	Tests. Anything called a test, quiz, readiness test, or assessment. Students work independently. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.
5	Pairs or Group Seatwork. Group projects, experiments, small group tasks. Teacher circulates or monitors from desk. Student engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.

Code No.	Explanation
6	Student Presentation. One or several students present to the class for more than 1 minute. The presentation is planned ahead of time rather than in response to a direct teacher question as in recitation. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.
7	Small Group Instruction. Teacher works with a group of students (three or more) for more than 1 minute while the rest of the class is in seatwork. This category takes priority over all others, e.g., don't code seatwork for the other students during this period. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Academic categories.
8	Procedural/Behavioral Presentation. The teacher presents or reviews classroom procedures or rules. This code should be used any time the teacher institutes and explains classroom procedures or rules governing student behavior. It should also be used when the teacher gives the class extensive feedback on their behavior, or discusses problems relating to student behavior in class, or students' following of classroom procedures. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Procedural categories.
9	Procedural/Administrative Routines. This code can include roll call, announcements, opening or closing routines (unless academic content is involved), giving directions for assignments (if over 1 minute), discussions of grades, distributing graded papers, recording grades in class, and changing seating. These activities must involve most of the students. For example, if roll call or distributing graded papers involves only the teacher and one or two students, while most of the students are doing seatwork, the "Individual Seatwork" code (3) should be used. Students engaged in this category should be counted in the On-task, Procedural categories.
10	Checking. Going over homework problems, a quiz, or assignment for the purpose of checking/grading it in class. Little or no teacher explanation or review is entailed. The teacher or students announce answers or write them on the board or overhead transparency. Students engaged in this category should be counted in the On-task, Procedural categories.

Code No.	Explanation
11	Transitions. Activities entailed in changing from one activity to another. Includes getting supplies, passing papers, waiting for everyone to get ready, quiet, or find the place. Activity codes for "Transitions" should not be noted in the Classroom Activity Record when the transition lasts less than 1 minute. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the On-task, Procedural categories.
12	Non-academic Activity. Games, discussions, TV, not related to content of the class. Students engaged in this activity should be counted in the Off-task, sanctioned category.
13	Dead Time. Two-thirds or more of the class have no assigned task; students are just waiting. Students falling into this category should be counted in the Dead Time category.

Degree of Student Success. Each time a Student Engagement Rating is made, the observer should also make an assessment of the level of student success in academic activities during the interval preceding the SER. If there have been no academic activities during the interval (e.g., most of the class has been engaged only in procedural activities, dead time, or non-academic games) do not rate success. Draw a big X (corner to corner) in the Success Rating blank.

The Success Rating is an estimate of the extent to which students are able to perform the work required of them. At best it is a high-inference measure based on whatever aspects of student work or work-related behavior can be observed. During seatwork, look for signs of confusion or frustration, failure to be engaged in the task at all, or frequent requests for help. During teacher presentations, judge success by students' responses to questions, appropriateness of student questions or comments, or any signs of ability or inability to understand the material. If there has been very little evidence about

student success (no overt indication for over half the students) in the interval before an SER, the observer should give an estimate but circle the number to indicate s/he has little confidence in the rating.

By "success" we mean a student performs or works at acceptable levels, without encountering frequent failure. An occasional error or misunderstanding should not be considered as evidence for a lack of success. If a student does not engage in a seatwork assignment at all, assume no success for him/her.

5 = Very high; all students are at least moderately successful.

4 = High; most students are successful; one or two may not be able to perform the task.

3 = Moderate success levels. Three or four do not appear to be performing successfully.

2 = Fair success levels. More than four -- up to one-half of the class -- are unsuccessful.

1 = Low success levels. More than one-half of the class cannot do the task.

If the activity is continued through more than one SER, the rating of success should pertain to student performance during the time since the previous SER.

Number in Class at Time. This should be the total number of students who are in the room and could therefore be considered in the Student Engagement Rating. This may differ from the number of students attending class that day because students may be out of the room at the time of the rating. The number noted here should be the total noted in eight categories of student engagement for that rating.

Categories of Student Engagement

Definitely On-task, Academic. Students classified in this category are working on an academic assignment or receiving an academic presentation, and are very clearly paying attention to the task. That is, the observer is very confident that they are actually engaged in the academic activity in which the teacher is expecting them to be engaged. In order to be considered academic in nature, the students must be reviewing old information or receiving new information from the teacher about skills involved in reading, writing, spelling, grammar, math, science, social studies, etc., or some set of facts involved in these or other areas, or they must be using such skills or facts in completing an assignment. This category does not include instructions from the teacher about activities which are preparatory to beginning an academic task, or necessary for completing an academic task, such as those described under the two categories of "On-task, Procedural," below. It does include activities after assignments which are related to academic skills -- reading library books, playing math games, etc.

Probably On-task, Academic. Students falling in this category are supposed to be working on an academic assignment or attending to an academic presentation, but cannot confidently be said to be attending; however, they are not definitely off-task either. Students falling in this category might be sitting at their seats with work in front of them, but are looking up at the wall or out the window at the time the rating is taken. The student might be thinking about the task, s/he might be resting momentarily before returning to work, or s/he might be daydreaming.

Definitely On-task, Procedural. Students classified in this category are clearly engaged in some procedural activity which is preparatory to beginning an academic activity, or is necessary for finishing it. Such activities include moving through transitions, handing back papers, sharpening pencils, getting out new materials or putting away used materials, turning in work, putting headings on paper, collecting books from other students, finding one's place in a textbook, and listening to the teacher give an assignment when this does not involve the teacher actually presenting academic information. (For example, listening to the teacher explain that "Your math assignment is to do all of the problems on pages 72 and 73," would be On-task, Procedural, but listening to the teacher say, "The way to add fractions is . . . ," would be On-task, Academic.) Sometimes procedural tasks involve the entire class (e.g., putting a heading on a paper for a test) and sometimes an individual will be doing something alone which can be considered procedural (such as turning in a paper). It also includes opening and closing routines and class procedures such as passing out school forms, checking papers (with no content review), recording grades, collecting money from students, or any other procedure initiated by the teacher for the sake of getting something done.

Probably On-task, Procedural. Students classified here are those whom you think are probably engaged in some procedural activity, but who are not clearly doing so. However, they are not obviously off-task or misbehaving. An example would be a student walking across the room; you suspect that he is going to some shelves to pick up some materials, but it is not absolutely clear to you whether he is doing this or just wandering around. The same category would apply to someone who is

waiting near the teacher's desk, and you suspect that the wait is part of continuing some academic activity, but you are not absolutely sure.

Off-task, Sanctioned. Students are classified here when, at the time of the rating, they are involved in some activity that is not academic or procedural in nature, but which is allowed in the classroom. Typically, this involves non-academic games, going to the bathroom, social discussions which are clearly permitted, and going to and from the wastebasket.

Off-task, Unsanctioned. Students are classified in this category when they are not attending to a presentation, when they are not engaging in seatwork, or when they are not doing what they are supposed to be doing. It is not essential that the teacher correct the students for them to be classified here. The definition of unsanctioned behaviors depends on the rules each teacher has established for his or her class, and, therefore, what is unsanctioned in one room may not be unsanctioned in another. Typically, however, behaviors which would be classified here would be: talking to one's neighbor when this is not allowed, cheating on a test, playing around in a disruptive manner instead of working, being out of one's seat when this is not allowed, grooming, writing notes, daydreaming, reading inappropriate materials, and visual wandering.

Dead Time. Students are classified here when the observer realizes that there is nothing specific which students are supposed to be doing and when they are not engaging in unsanctioned behavior. This would include students who are waiting for a transition as part of the whole class and students who have finished all of their assigned work and who have not been given anything else to do.

Can't See. If there are students in the classroom who cannot be seen by the observer, they should be included in this category. This would include students working behind dividers and any student whose back is to the observer when it is necessary to see the face in order to make an accurate rating. This category would not include students who were out of the room at the time the rating was taken, because these students are not counted in the "Number in Class at Time" for that particular rating.

JMIS

PROPERTY OF R&D CENTER
Do not use without permission

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT RATINGS

Teacher #_____ Period #_____ School #_____ Subject #_____ Date_____

# of SS_____ # Adults_____ Grade_____ Observer #_____

	1	2	3	4
Time				
Activity Code				
Success Rating				
# in room				
# def. on, acad.				
# prob. on, acad.				
# def. on, proc.				
# prob. on, proc.				
# off, sanc.				
# off, unsanc.				
# dead time				
# can't see				

	5	6	7	8
Time				
Activity Code				
Success Rating				
# in room				
# def. on, acad.				
# prob. on, acad.				
# def. on, proc.				
# prob. on, proc.				
# off, sanc.				
# off, unsanc.				
# dead time				
# can't see				

Activity Codes

1 Content Development: Teacher presentation of content.

2 Content Development: Recitation/Discussion.

3 Individual Seatwork.

4 Tests.

5 Pairs or Group Seatwork.

6 Student Presentation.

7 Small Group Instruction.

8 Procedural/Behavioral Presentation.

9 Procedural/Administrative Routines.

10 Checking.

11 Transition.

12 Non-academic Activity.

13 Dead Time.

Success Ratings

5 Very high; all students are at least moderately successful

4 High; most students are successful; one or two may not be able to perform the task

3 Moderate success levels. Three or four do not appear to be performing successfully

2 Fair success levels. More than four -- up to one-half of the class -- are unsuccessful

1 Low success levels. More than one-half of the class cannot do the task

Random Number Sequence

4	2	6	6	3	5	4	2	4	5	5	5	4	6	2	6	4	3
4	6	3	3	4	6	5	2	4	2	3	4	5	6	2	3	2	2
5	3	3	5	3	6	6	5	2	6	2	3	4	4	5	2	5	4

Appendix F

Training manual for Component Rating form

JMIS

PROPERTY OF R&D CENTER
Do not use without permission

GUIDELINES FOR USING JMIS COMPONENT RATINGS

The Component Ratings provide numerical estimates of a wide variety of behavior, characteristics, and activities related to the organization and management of classroom behavior and instruction. The system is meant to provide a comprehensive numerical profile of a classroom, in order to supplement other measures of classroom behavior, including the low-inference measures (Student Engagement Ratings) and Classroom Activity Records.

The ratings are made on 5-point scales. Usually, these scales are defined as follows:

5 The behavior is exhibited frequently or the description is highly characteristic of the teacher.

4 The behavior is exhibited often or the description is mostly characteristic of the teacher.

3 The behavior occurs occasionally or the description is somewhat characteristic of the teacher.

2 The behavior is exhibited rarely or the description is not very characteristic of the teacher.

1 The behavior never occurs or is not at all characteristic.

A few of the Component Ratings have differently defined scale points. These variables are marked with an asterisk on the rating form; the definitions of their scale points are included in the description of the variable.

How to Use the Scales

At the end of an observation period, the observer uses the Component Rating form to summarize his/her judgment on each of the variables. All scales must be rated, except for 1i, 3c, and 9d and the set of teacher reactions to disruptive behavior when disruptive behavior has not occurred. Make your rating of each scale independently: The fact that a teacher is rated high or low on some scale does not mean that will be true for another scale. Also, let your judgment be based upon events you observed that day, not the impression you have formed from prior observations.

Descriptions of JMIS Component Ratings

1. Instructional Management

1a. Describes objectives clearly. Has the teacher indicated the purpose of the lesson(s) or what the students are to learn during the lesson? Look for indications of this in materials given to the students, written on the board or overhead projector, and listen for it when the teacher is introducing or summing up the lesson. It should be clear what the students are expected to know or to be able to do as a result of participation in the lessons.

1b. Uses a variety of materials. During a lesson or activity a teacher may use numerous media and materials, or may restrict the activities to a single set of materials. Generally, the minimum set of materials that will be used will be workbook, textbook, or ditto handout accompanied by verbal teacher explanation and the blackboard or overhead projector presentation. Other materials or media include movie projectors, tape recorders, audio cassettes, manipulative materials, games, and supplementary reading materials, as well as teacher-made or pupil-made materials. Rate a 1 if the minimum set of materials is characteristic of most lessons. Rate a 5 if the teacher incorporates a variety of materials throughout the class period, and rate a midpoint if some variety is evident, but only in some lessons or parts of a lesson.

1c. Materials are ready and available in sufficient quantity. Rate a 5 if all materials and equipment are ready for use on all occasions during an observation. Rate a 1 if materials are a significant source of problems in the class; e.g., the teacher continuously runs out of materials, spends a lot of time hunting them up and/or getting them into pupil hands, or ditto sheets are too faint to be legible, equipment cannot be used because bulbs, batteries, or extension cords are missing, etc.

1d. Clear directions for assignments or activities. Indication of clear directions can be found in step-by-step instructions given verbally by the teacher and repeated by the students, and written instructions either on the blackboard, overhead projector, or in handout form. Also, an indication of clear directions can be obtained by the ease with which students begin their use of the materials, student confusion, and repeated directions issued by the teacher.

1e. Waits for attention. Does the teacher begin giving directions or instruction only when students are ready, quiet, and attending? Or does s/he start talking while students are still engaged in other tasks getting supplies out, talking to their neighbors, etc.? A high rating on this category indicates the teacher secures attention of all students before giving instructions or explanations to the class.

1f. Encourages analysis, builds reasoning skills. The teacher's questions and/or assignments encourage analysis and reflection by the students (understanding as well as memorization). The teacher asks students to explain or justify their conclusions, or to give reasons or background information. The teacher explains why s/he engages in certain activities, and seeks adequate information before forming conclusions.

1g. Assignments or activities for different students. The degree to which the teacher allowed for individual differences in aptitudes or interests in required or optional assignments. Rate a 1 if all pupils were required to do the same thing; a 2 if there is some provision for differences, e.g., optional extra work or choice in the topic of an assignment; 3 if there is moderate differentiation in assignments, e.g., students are allowed to choose the activity on which they work after completing a basic assignment, or most students work on the same basic assignment and a few (one to three) students have different assignments; a 4 if there is considerable provision for differences, e.g., individual and group projects for many of the students; and a 5 if there is great attention to differences, e.g., extensive use of contracts for assignments, or individualized activities.

1h. Appropriate pacing of lessons. Lessons and activities proceed neither too quickly nor too slowly for most of the students in the class. The teacher avoids spending too much time on one aspect of the lesson and hurrying through the rest. Once a lesson begins or an assignment is made and students are engaged, lessons proceed apace without frequent interruptions, false starts, or backtracking.

1i. Clear explanations and presentations of content. Instruction is presented in a coherent sequence; adequate examples are provided; skills, when taught, are appropriately demonstrated. The teacher relates information to different ability levels as needed, uses a variety of approaches if the content is not initially comprehended, uses appropriate

vocabulary. Clear, precise language is used. If no content is explained or presented during the period, draw a line through all numbers of this scale.

1j. Monitors student understanding. The teacher actively seeks information about student comprehension during content development or seatwork activities. Look for frequent questions by teacher during class presentations and for techniques for obtaining feedback from many children, such as quick drills, patterned turns, or show-of-hands with correct answers. The teacher circulates widely during seatwork, checking student work. Student assignments are frequently returned with indications that the teacher has reviewed them.

1k. Consistently enforces work standards. The teacher's expectations for quality of student work, with respect to both performance and effort. are clearly conveyed to or understood by the students. The teacher does not routinely accept performance or effort below the set standard. Poor quality work may be refused or returned for re-doing or completion. Deadlines for completing work are not ignored or routinely extended. All students are expected to work up to their capacity; the teacher does not give up on or ignore one student or a subgroup of the class.

2. Room Arrangement

2a. Suitable traffic patterns. The teacher and students are able to move about the room easily, without interrupting each other's work. Lanes to the doorway, pencil sharpener, and major work and group areas are open. Needed materials and supplies are accessible. The teacher can get to each student for private contacts.

2b. Degree of visibility. The student desks/chairs and work areas and any place the teacher spends much time (e.g., teacher's desk, overhead projector, small group work area) are placed so that a clear line of sight is available. The teacher can see all of the students; the students can see the teacher and relevant instructional displays during whole class instruction.

3. Procedures

3a. Efficient administrative routines. These routines include attendance checks, money collection, tardies, or other record keeping, and teacher desk and file maintenance. The teacher has routines which minimize

their intrusion into instructional time. The desk and file area are arranged neatly enough to avoid lost materials, time, or records.

3b. Appropriate general procedures. General procedures include those for coming-and-going from the room, seating arrangements, using materials and supplies, and when the teacher leaves the room. Also included are rules or procedures governing the level of noise during different activities, movement around the room, transitions from one activity to another, and student response or question signals (e.g., hands raised). Rate a 5 only if adequate procedures are present in all relevant observable areas. Rate a 3 if inefficient or poor procedures are evident in a few key areas. Rate a 1 if many areas have no procedures and/or the procedures are not appropriate (i.e., don't work, cause confusion or lost time).

3c. Efficient small group procedures. These include coming-and-going from the group area, obtaining or bringing needed materials, handling come-ups and other interruptions, procedures for students not in the group with the teacher, and student response or question signals. (Draw a line through scale if small groups are not used.)

3d. Suitable routines for assigning, checking, and collecting work. Assignments are given clearly; procedures for communicating and maintaining a record of assignments and for handling previously absent students are established. Checking routines (exchanging papers, how to mark correct or incorrect answers) are appropriate. Procedures for collecting and returning daily work are established and efficient.

3e. Efficient opening and closing routines. The class follows established routines for beginning and ending the period in an orderly manner. Opening or closing activities often used include: short academic review activities (warmups), readying pencils, heading papers, writing in journals, recording the day's assignments, straightening desks, returning supplies, and tidying the room (at the end of the period), announcements and reminders from the teacher. Rate a 1 if no opening and closing routines seem to have been planned and used (the period begins and ends with confusion or wasted time); rate a 5 if opening and closing routines are well established and the beginning and end of the class period proceed smoothly and efficiently.

4. Meeting Student Concerns

*4a. Student success. By "success" we mean a student performs or works at acceptable levels, without encountering frequent failure. An occasional error or misunderstanding should not be considered as evidence for a lack of success. If a student does not engage in a seatwork assignment at all, assume no success for him/her.

5 Very high; all students are at least moderately successful.

4 High; most students are successful; one or two may not be able to perform the task.

3 Moderate success levels. Three or four do not appear to be performing successfully.

2 Fair success levels. More than four --up to one-half of the class-- are unsuccessful.

1 Low success levels. More than one-half of the class cannot do the task.

4b. Student aggression. The extent of verbal and physical abuse of students by other students. This includes name-calling, sarcasm, pushing, hostility, hitting, etc., whether or not it is observed by the teacher. Do not count reciprocated, playful behavior.

4c. Attention spans considered in lesson design. Activities are paced so that students do not sit inactive (as in seatwork) for long periods of time. Also, note the use of occasional rest breaks and variations in teaching style to arouse interest or attention.

4d. Activities related to student interest and background. Evidence of this characteristic can be displayed in interaction by the teacher when s/he makes reference to relationships between content being studied and aspects of the students' lives or interests. Other relevant information may be obtained from bulletin boards, materials used by the teacher, or lessons in which pupil interests are clearly taken into account, such as activities in which pupils describe parents' occupations, trips they have taken, etc. Another instance of this type of behavior is when the teacher presents contributions of different groups of people, when members of those groups are present in the class.

5. Managing Pupil Behavior

*5a. Restrictions on student discretionary behaviors. To what extent can students engage in discretionary behaviors (at times other than during teacher presentations) without requesting permission from the teacher? Discretionary behaviors include aspects of personal conduct that are neither intrinsically disruptive nor essential to instructional activities: movement out of seat, pencil sharpening, talking to peers, use of time after completion of assigned work.

5 Students must ask permission before leaving seats for any reason or speaking to anyone. Few aspects of personal conduct are left to students' discretion.

3 Students may get out of seats, talk to peers or to teacher, and choose activities without permission of the teacher during certain times or within clearly defined limits.

1 Very few restrictions on student discretionary behaviors. Except during teacher presentations, students may talk, move out of seat, choose activities freely as long as they do assigned work and respect rights of others.

*5b. Rewards appropriate performance. Appropriate performance means actual student accomplishment. Rewards can include nonperfunctory teacher praise, approval, recognition, displays of good work, privileges, tokens, check marks, pats-on-the-back, etc.

Use the following scale:

1 None or very few conspicuous rewards, little praise.

3 Moderate use of rewards: Some praise, some display of student work, stickers on papers, moderate use of extra privileges.

5 Very frequent use of rewards: Much posting of student work, extravagent praise, frequent use of extra privileges, tokens, concrete rewards, star charts or other public recognition.

5c. Signals appropriate behavior. This class of behavior refers to any activities, both verbal and otherwise, which the teacher uses to let students know that they should begin behaving in a particular manner. Some typical signals include using a bell to signal time to begin an activity, lights on or lights off, a sign with Stop and Go to control movement or noise level. Teachers also may move to a certain place in the room. Verbal statements which orient the students toward behaving in a particular

mode are also signals. Examples of these include such phrases as: "Does everyone have his thinking cap on?" or "Let's have all eyes up front." However, orders or commands to pay attention directed at inattentive students will not be considered signals or cues for appropriate behavior. The present category is reserved for signals which have been taught to the class and which are designed to elicit orienting responses without singling out individuals in any obvious manner.

5d. Consistency in managing behavior. How predictable is the teacher's response to appropriate and inappropriate behavior? What is the degree to which the teacher maintains an unvarying response pattern? Rate a 1 if the teacher is highly inconsistent. The teacher frequently allows a behavior on one occasion and then disapproves of it at another time. The teacher often allows deviations from rules and established procedures. Rate a 2 for moderate inconsistency. Rate a 3 if there is some inconsistency, perhaps limited to a single area, e.g., call-outs. Rate a 4 if the teacher is usually consistent, with only an occasional variation from rules and procedures of a minor nature. Rate a 5 if the teacher is highly consistent. Approved behavior remains constant across tasks, unless provided for by rules and procedures.

5e. Effective monitoring. The degree to which the teacher is aware of the behavior in the classroom. This skill requires visual scanning and alertness; the teacher avoids becoming engrossed in an activity with a single student or group of students, or fixated in one area of the room. The teacher sees misbehavior when it occurs, rather than detecting a problem only after it has escalated into a highly visible incident.

6. Disruptive Student Behavior

*6a. Amount of disruption. On this scale you are to estimate the amount of disruptive behavior that occurs in the classroom. "Disruptive behavior" refers to any pupil behavior that interferes with instructional, attentional, or work activities of the teacher or two or more other students. Excluded from this definition are inattentive behaviors and behaviors that involve only one or two other students, such as one student whispering to another, writing notes, or goofing off. However, if the behavior elicits the attention, although not necessarily the involvement, of numerous other students, then it would be classified as disruptive behavior. A 5 rating would be obtained if such behavior occurs with a high degree of fre-

quency. Use a 5 to note a situation which is habitual and is a constant problem for the teacher and other students. A 4 would indicate frequent occurrences of such behavior (e.g., once every 10 minutes). A mid-range rating would be obtained if such behaviors occur with moderate frequency, such as several on the average per hour, occasionally moderately or severely disruptive. A rating of 2 would indicate one or two instances per hour, almost always mild. A rating of 1 would indicate the complete absence of any such incidents. Note that "disruptive behavior" does not have to be as extreme as a knife fight. Rather, it is any behavior that distracts or interferes with two or more students attending to their work or the lesson.

*6b. Source of disruptive behavior. How many students are involved in creating disruptions in the class? Rate a 1 if a single pupil is the source, a 2 if two pupils are the source, a 3 when several pupils are the source, and a 4 when many (but not half the class) are the source and there is no particular pattern. Rate a 5 when half the class or more is involved. If there was no disruptive behavior, mark a line through the set of numbers for 6b through 6h.

6c. Disruption stops quickly. The behavior is terminated without involving additional students or without continuous interruption to the activities in the lesson. There is a rapid return to normality.

6d. Cites rules or procedures. The teacher calls students' attention to proper behavior, as indicated by posted or previously explained rules and/or procedures.

6e. Non-verbal contact. The teacher stops or attempts to stop disruptive behavior by moving closer to the offender, by eye contact, by touching, holding, or other physical contact, or by using a non-verbal signal, such as pointing, gesturing, or signalling.

6f. Desist statement. The teacher calls a student's name and/or tells the student(s) to stop the behavior, with or without explanation.

6g. Criticism. Teacher criticizes or demeans student.

6h. Penalty. Uses penalties in response to misbehavior. Penalties include detention, demerits or checks (when these lead to a penalty), fines, writing sentences, withholding privileges (e.g., being last to leave the room, losing "quiet talking" permission, losing library or other privileges).

6i. Ignores. The teacher makes no attempt to terminate the disruptive behavior. S/he may watch the students, but takes no action; or the teacher may look away. The observer should be reasonably certain that the teacher has seen the disruptive behavior.

7. Inappropriate Behavior

7a. Amount of inappropriate behavior. "Inappropriate behavior" means all types of nondisruptive behavior that are contrary to stated or implied classroom rules or procedures. We will exclude "disruptive behavior," because that is already covered.

Some common types of inappropriate behavior might include talking out-of-turn (call-outs), whispering to neighbors, passing notes, being out of one's seat, reading or working on an inappropriate task, tardy entry to class, failure to complete work, not following established procedures, gum chewing, or goofing off. Of course, any of the preceding may be disruptive under some circumstances; but we want to estimate the frequency of nondisruptive inappropriate behaviors that occur, and the teacher's reactions to them. Use the usual scale.

*7b. Source. How many students exhibit inappropriate behavior more than occasionally?

1 One student
2 Two students
3 Several students
4 Many (but not half) of the students
5 Half or more of the students

7c. Inappropriate behavior stops quickly. (See 6c.)

7d. Cites rules or procedures. (See 6d.)

7e. Non-verbal contact. (See 6e.)

7f. Desist statement. (See 6f.)

7g. Criticism. (See 6g.)

7h. Penalty. (See 6h.)

7i. Ignores. (See 6i.)

8. Classroom Climate

8a. Conveys value of curriculum. Teacher emphasizes value, usefulness, importance of knowledge and skills of the curriculum. Teacher conveys interest, excitement.

8b. Students are task oriented. Task orientation of students refers to the extent to which students appear to accept the importance of or necessity for doing assigned work. Rate a 5 if students support and demonstrate enthusiasm for assignments and activities, seem eager to participate. Rate a 3 if students appear to be accepting and willing, but not enthusiastic. Rate a 1 if students show resistance, complain, and/or avoid engaging in assigned tasks.

8c. Relaxed, pleasant atmosphere. The teacher and students seem to get along nicely. There is an absence of friction, tension, or antagonism; behavior is friendly and courteous. The teacher and children obviously like each other.

9. Miscellaneous

9a. Distracting mannerisms. A distracting mannerism is some gesture, vocal quality, or behavior of the teacher that causes the students to be distracted from some aspects of the lesson. The observer will have to judge whether the behavior is distracting to the children and whether it continues to be distracting after a period of time.

*9b. Listening skills. This refers to the attending behaviors of the teacher when a student has been given permission to talk to him/her. High ratings in this category indicate that the teacher exhibits listening behaviors that communicate attention, acceptance, and encouragement. These behaviors include eye contact; appropriate verbal statements or questions ("Can you tell me more?" or "You seem upset." or "Why?"); gestures (nodding) or physical orientation to the student; and appropriate silence (not interrupting or cutting off the student).

*9c. Externally imposed interruptions. An interruption is an event that intrudes into the classroom environment and distracts the class and the teacher from their task. These include calls from the office, P.A. announcements, visitors, late-arriving students, and loud hallway noises. Estimate the average number per hour during the observation.

9d. Managing interruptions. Given that one or more interruptions occurred, the teacher has a procedure or otherwise handles the interruption so as to minimize its interference with instruction. During the interruption, the students are well-behaved, continuing with their work, if appropriate, or else waiting quietly for the interruption to end.

*9e. Avoidance behavior during seatwork. Extent of persistent work avoidance behavior by students during seatwork activities. If class period includes no seatwork activity, draw a line through the scale points for this rating.

5 Half or more of the class frequently or persistently avoids engagement.

4 From five to one-half of the students frequently avoid seatwork engagement.

3 Three or four students avoid seatwork engagement.

2 One or two students avoid seatwork engagement.

1 No avoidance. All students engage in seatwork.

*9f. Participation in discussion/recitation. Extent of student participation and overt response in whole class or small group discussions/recitations/content development. Participation may be volunteered or called for by the teacher.

5 Most students participate (all but one or two).

4 A majority of students participate (two-thirds plus).

3 One-half participates (to two-thirds).

2 Fewer than half the students participate.

1 Participation by only a few (one to three) students.

PROPERTY OF R&D CENTER
Do not use without permission

JMIS

JMIS COMPONENT RATINGS

Teacher #____ Period #____ School #____ Subject #____ Date_____

# of Students ____ # of Adults ____ Grade ___ Observer #___

1. Instructional Management

5 4 3 2 1 a. Describes objectives clearly

5 4 3 2 1 b. Variety of materials

5 4 3 2 1 c. Materials are ready

5 4 3 2 1 d. Clear directions

5 4 3 2 1 e. Waits for attention

5 4 3 2 1 f. Encourages analysis, builds reasoning skills

5 4 3 2 1 g. Assignments or activities for different students

5 4 3 2 1 h. Appropriate pacing of lesson

5 4 3 2 1 i. Clear explanations and presentations

5 4 3 2 1 j. Monitors student understanding

5 4 3 2 1 k. Consistently enforces work standards

2. Room Arrangement

5 4 3 2 1 a. Suitable traffic patterns

5 4 3 2 1 b. Degree of visibility

3. Rules and Procedures

5 4 3 2 1 a. Efficient administrative routines

5 4 3 2 1 b. Appropriate general procedures

5 4 3 2 1 c. Efficient small group procedures

5 4 3 2 1 d. Suitable routines for assigning, checking, and collecting work

5 4 3 2 1 e. Efficient opening and closing routines

4. Meeting Student Concerns

5 4 3 2 1 *a. Student success

5 4 3 2 1 b. Student aggression

5 4 3 2 1 c. Attention spans considered in lesson

5 4 3 2 1 d. Activities related to student interests or backgrounds

5. Managing Pupil Behavior

5 4 3 2 1 *a. Restrictions on student discretionary behaviors

5 4 3 2 1 *b. Rewards appropriate performance

5 4 3 2 1 c. Signals appropriate behavior

5 4 3 2 1 d. Consistency in managing behavior

5 4 3 2 1 e. Effective monitoring

6. Disruptive Pupil Behavior

5 4 3 2 1 *a. Amount of disruption

5 4 3 2 1 *b. Source of disruption

5 4 3 2 1 c. Stops quickly

5 4 3 2 1 d. Cites rules or procedures

5 4 3 2 1 e. Non-verbal contact

5 4 3 2 1 f. Desist statement

5 4 3 2 1 g. Criticism

5 4 3 2 1 h. Penalty

5 4 3 2 1 i. Ignores

JMIS COMPONENT RATINGS (CON'T)

Teacher #____ Period #_____ School #____ Subject #_____ Date_____

# of Students ____ # of Adults ____ Grade ___ Observer #___

7. Inappropriate Student Behavior

5 4 3 2 1 *a. Amount

5 4 3 2 1 *b. Source

5 4 3 2 1 c. Stops quickly

5 4 3 2 1 d. Cites rules or procedures

5 4 3 2 1 e. Non-verbal contact

5 4 3 2 1 f. Desist statement

5 4 3 2 1 g. Criticism

5 4 3 2 1 h. Penalty

5 4 3 2 1 i. Ignores

8. Classroom Climate

5 4 3 2 1 a. Conveys value of curriculum

5 4 3 2 1 b. Students are task oriented

5 4 3 2 1 c. Relaxed, pleasant atmosphere

9. Miscellaneous

5 4 3 2 1 a. Distracting mannerisms

5 4 3 2 1 b. Listening skills

4 3 2 1 0 *c. Externally imposed interruptions

5 4 3 2 1 d. Manages interruptions

5 4 3 2 1 *e. Avoidance behavior during seatwork

5 4 3 2 1 *f. Participation in discussion/recitation

PROPERTY OF R&D CENTER
Do not use without permission

JMIS

ADDENDUM TO JMIS COMPONENT RATINGS

First Days of School

Teacher #_____ Period #_____ School #____ Subject #____ Date_____

# of SS_____ # Adults_____ Grade_____ Observer #___ Page___of___

5 4 3 2 1 1. Teacher presents, reviews, or discusses classroom rules or procedures.

5--Very thorough presentation of classroom rules and procedures. Half or more than half of observed class period is devoted to presentation, review, reteaching, practice, and/or feedback.

4--Thorough presentation; less than half of observed class period taken up with teaching of rules and procedures.

3--Moderate amount of attention given to presentation of rules and procedures. Some aspects of expected classroom behavior are discussed or reviewed; teacher provides feedback or reviews.

2--Small amount of attention given to teaching rules and procedures. Presentation, review, or feedback provided for only one or two aspects of expected classroom behavior.

1--No presentation, review, reteaching, feedback, reminders, or teacher-led discussion of rules and procedures.

5 4 3 2 1 2. Presentation of rules, procedures, and penalties is clear. (Draw a line through scale if rating for 1 above is 1.)

5--Teacher's expectations are clearly and specifically presented; terms are defined; no signs of student confusion are noted.

1--Presentation is vague, inadequate; terms are not defined; students appear to be confused or improvise their own rules and procedures.

5 4 3 2 1 3. Presentation includes explanation of rationale for rules and procedures. (Draw a line through scale if rating for 1 above is 1.)

5--Teacher presents or elicits from students a discussion of reasons for rules and procedures. Teacher's rationales are meaningful to students.

1--No rationales are discussed.

ADDENDUM TO JMIS COMPONENT RATINGS (CONT'D)

First Days of School

Teacher #_____ Period #_____ School #_____ Subject #_____ Date_____

# of SS_____ # Adults_____ Grade_____ Observer #_____ Page____of____

5 4 3 2 1 4. Presentation of rules and procedures includes rehearsal or practice. (Draw a line through scale if rating for 1 above is 1.)

5--Teacher includes appropriate student rehearsal or guided practice of routines, procedures, and responses to cues as part of his/her presentation.

1--No rehearsal or practice is used for even the most complex procedures.

5 4 3 2 1 5. Teacher provides feedback and review. (This scale must be rated.)

5--Teacher gives prompt, accurate information to the class and to individuals about how well they do in practicing or using procedures in the first days.

1--Inaccurate feedback or none given to most students about their performance of procedures or following of rules.

5 4 3 2 1 6. Teacher stays in charge of all students, avoiding long involvement with individuals or small groups and absence from the room. (Must be rated.)

5--Statement is very characteristic of the teacher in the first days of school.

1--Statement is not characteristic; teacher leaves most or all of the class without close supervision and leadership several times during observation.

Appendix G

Observer Ratings of Teachers forms

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT STUDY

OBSERVER RATINGS OF TEACHER

1. How ready is this class at this point? That is, how well are routines and expectations established so that the room runs with a minimum of interruptions and maximum task orientation?

   1 = Not at all ready
   5 = Extremely ready

2. In the observer's opinion, how often does the teacher let the class get out of hand, or to a point where half or more pupils are off-task?

   1 = Never
   5 = Frequently--several times per observation

3. How often does wandering occur that is obviously not task related?

   1 = Not much at all
   5 = A lot

4. What is the noise level of the classroom in general on a day-to-day basis?

   1 = Low, very little if any
   5 = High, a lot of talking, moving around

5. What is the teacher's expectation regarding talk among students during seatwork?

   1 = Students must maintain rigid silence.
   2 = Students are allowed to talk only in getting help with seatwork.
   3 = Talking allowed only when work is finished or with special permission.
   4 = Students can converse quietly without special permission.
   5 = Students are allowed to talk as much as they please unless it becomes very disruptive.

6. What is the efficiency of transitions between activities or formats?

   1 = Usually has overly long transitions, poor systems for distributing materials, little student cooperation.
   5 = Mostly smooth, efficient transitions with efficient procedures, good student cooperation.

7. How often are "come-ups" observed while teacher is engaged with another student or lesson?

   1 = Never
   5 = Frequently, constantly

8-10. What is the teacher's usual response to come-ups? (Draw a line through scales 8-10 if rating for 7 was 1.)

8. Teacher ignores student.

1 = Never
3 = Sometimes
5 = Always

9. Teacher tells student to sit down.

1 = Never
3 = Sometimes
5 = Always

10. Teacher answers student's question.

1 = Never
3 = Sometimes
5 = Always

11. How often do students approach teacher, leaving their desks, when they need help from her?

1 = Never
5 = Frequently

12. How often do students raise their hands when they need help from the teacher?

1 = Never
5 = Always

13. How often do students call out without raising their hands when they need teacher's help?

1 = Never
5 = Frequently

14. How often did the teacher leave the room during your observations? (Don't count 10-second intervals such as posting of absence slip.)

1 = Never
3 = During half
5 = Once per observation

15. How well does the teacher usually handle disruptions or disruptive students?

1 = Very poorly; the situation gets worse
5 = Well; stops the behavior quickly

16. How well has the teacher utilized the space of the classroom (efficient use of available space, easy access to materials, etc.)?

    1 = Poorly; heavy concentrations in particular areas
    2 = Fairly
    3 = Good
    4 = Better
    5 = Excellent; all parts of room used well

17. In terms of equipment and supplies, how ready was the teacher for the first week of school?

    1 = Not ready; teacher had not anticipated needs, problems.
    5 = Very ready; all necessary equipment and supplies were on hand, in good working order

18. Does the teacher consistently plan <u>enough</u> work for students during a typical observation?

    1 = Never
    5 = Always

19. Are assignments too hard; students can't get started, or continually need help?

    1 = Never
    5 = Always

20. How often does the teacher allow an activity to <u>continue too long</u>, until pupils get off-task?

    1 = Never
    5 = Always

21. Are typical assignments too short or easy?

    1 = Never
    5 = Always

22. How many students use <u>free-time materials</u> (optional or extra-credit activities, optional reading materials, games, or other materials students may use when assigned work is finished) during an average observation? (This does not include school-wide reading time.)

    1 = None
    3 = Half of the students
    5 = All or almost all

23. In giving instructions, how often does the teacher question to determine the extent of students' understanding?

    1 = Never
    5 = Always

24. How successful has the teacher been in establishing and maintaining students' responsibility (accountability) for their work?

    1 = Not at all; this teacher does not usually know if students finish daily work; s/he has not communicated high academic standards.
    5 = Very successful; teacher checks all work, firmly holds students to high academic standards, gives plenty of academic feedback.

25. Effective routines for communicating assignments to students. (Consider whether the teacher has a regular place for writing the day's assignment, whether assignments are given only verbally or also written somewhere, whether the teacher has a posted record of past assignments, whether the teacher describes requirements and due dates clearly, whether teacher requires students to maintain an assignment sheet.)

    1 = No routine; teacher inconsistent, gives little information about assignments.
    5 = Effective routine; teacher does much to insure that students know what their assignments are, when they are due, etc.

26-33. How often did you see students receive the following types of academic feedback from the teacher? (1 = Never, 5 = At least once per observation)

    26. Notes on papers

    27. Messages in small groups

    28. Grades on papers

    29. Papers on bulletin board

    30. Verbal citing of individuals in front of class

    31. Individual conferences with teacher

    32. Evaluative comments to the class as a whole

    33. Other. Please specify.

34. How confident did this teacher appear in the first 8 weeks of school?

    1 = Not confident; scared, timid, unsure, nervous
    5 = Very confident; relaxed, in control

35. How warm and pleasant is this teacher's manner toward the children?

    1 = Cold, unpleasant, harsh
    5 = Very warm, pleasant, likeable

36. How enthusiastic is this teacher?

    1 = Very unenthusiastic, draggy, tired, dull.
    5 = Very enthusiastic, alert, stimulating, vivacious.

37. What kind of showmanship (showwomanship) does this teacher display?

    1 = Teacher is even-spoken, non-dramatic (although s/he may be enthusiastic in non-dramatic ways).
    5 = Teacher is dramatic, theatrical, creates suspense.

38. List any extenuating circumstances or unusual contraints which you think affected this teacher's ability to manage and organize this class. Some possible examples: unreasonable number of students (state number), unusual number of problem students in one class, great range of students' ability, inadequate equipment, supplies, space, furniture, etc.

39. If you observed both classes of this teacher, please comment on any differences you noticed between the two sections.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT STUDY

OBSERVER RATINGS OF TEACHER

1. In this teacher's class(es), how well are routines and expectations established so that the room runs with a minimum of interruptions and maximum task orientation?

   1 = Not at all ready
   5 = Extremely ready

2. In the observer's opinion, how often does the teacher let the class get out of hand, or to a point where half or more pupils are off-task?

   1 = Never
   5 = Frequently--several times per observation

3. How often does wandering occur that is obviously not task related?

   1 = Not much at all
   5 = A lot

4. What is the noise level of the classroom in general on a day-to-day basis?

   1 = Low, very little if any
   5 = High, a lot of talking, moving around

5. What is the teacher's expectation regarding talk among students during seatwork?

   1 = Students must maintain rigid silence.
   2 = Students are allowed to talk only in getting help with seatwork.
   3 = Talking allowed only when work is finished or with special permission.
   4 = Students can converse quietly without special permission.
   5 = Students are allowed to talk as much as they please unless it becomes very disruptive.

6. What is the efficiency of transitions between activities or formats?

   1 = Usually has overly long transitions, poor systems for distributing materials, little student cooperation.
   5 = Mostly smooth, efficient transitions with efficient procedures, good student cooperation.

7. How often are "come-ups" observed while teacher is engaged with another student or lesson?

1 = Never
5 = Frequently, constantly

8-10. What is the teacher's usual response to come-ups? (Draw a line through scales 8-10 if rating for 7 was 1.)

8. Teacher ignores student.

1 = Never
3 = Sometimes
5 = Always

9. Teacher tells student to sit down.

1 = Never
3 = Sometimes
5 = Always

10. Teacher answers student's question.

1 = Never
3 = Sometimes
5 = Always

11. How often do students approach teacher, leaving their desks, when they need help from her?

1 = Never
5 = Frequently

12. How often do students raise their hands when they need help from the teacher?

1 = Never
5 = Always

13. How often do students call out without raising their hands when they need teacher's help?

1 = Never
5 = Frequently

14. How often did the teacher leave the room during your observations? (Don't count 10-second intervals such as posting of absence slip.)

1 = Never
3 = During half
5 = Once per observation

15. How well does the teacher usually handle disruptions or disruptive students?

    1 = Very poorly; the situation gets worse
    5 = Well; stops the behavior quickly

16. How well has the teacher utilized the space of the classroom (efficient use of available space, easy access to materials, etc.)?

    1 = Poorly; heavy concentrations in particular areas
    2 = Fairly
    3 = Good
    4 = Better
    5 = Excellent; all parts of room used well

17. Not applicable

18. Does the teacher consistently plan <u>enough</u> work for students during a typical observation?

    1 = Never
    5 = Always

19. Are assignments too hard; students can't get started, or continually need help?

    1 = Never
    5 = Always

20. How often does the teacher allow an activity to <u>continue too long</u>, until pupils get off-task?

    1 = Never
    5 = Always

21. Are typical assignments too short or easy?

    1 = Never
    5 = Always

22. How many students use <u>free-time materials</u> (optional or extra-credit activities, optional reading materials, games, or other materials students may use when assigned work is finished) during an average observation? (This does not include school-wide reading time.)

    1 = None
    3 = Half of the students
    5 = All or almost all

23. In giving instructions, how often does the teacher question to determine the extent of students' understanding?

    1 = Never
    5 = Always

24. How successful has the teacher been in establishing and maintaining students' responsibility (accountability) for their work?

1 = Not at all; this teacher does not usually know if students finish daily work; s/he has not communicated high academic standards.
5 = Very successful; teacher checks all work, firmly holds students to high academic standards, gives plenty of academic feedback.

25. Effective routines for communicating assignments to students. (Consider whether the teacher has a regular place for writing the day's assignment, whether assignments are given only verbally or also written somewhere, whether the teacher has a posted record of past assignments, whether the teacher describes requirements and due dates clearly, whether teacher requires students to maintain an assignment sheet.)

1 = No routine; teacher inconsistent, gives little information about assignments.
5 = Effective routine; teacher does much to insure that students know what their assignments are, when they are due, etc.

26-33. How often did you see students receive the following types of <u>academic feedback</u> from the teacher? (1 = Never, 5 = At least once per observation)

26. Notes on papers

27. Messages in small groups

28. Grades on papers

29. Papers on bulletin board

30. Verbal citing of individuals in front of class

31. Individual conferences with teacher

32. Evaluative comments to the class as a whole

33. Other. Please specify.

34. How confident does this teacher appear?

1 = Not confident; scared, timid, unsure, nervous
5 = Very confident; relaxed, in control

35. How warm and pleasant is this teacher's manner toward the children?

1 = Cold, unpleasant, harsh
5 = Very warm, pleasant, likeable

36. How enthusiastic is this teacher?

    1 = Very unenthusiastic, draggy, tired, dull.
    5 = Very enthusiastic, alert, stimulating, vivacious.

37. What kind of showmanship (showwomanship) does this teacher display?

    1 = Teacher is even-spoken, non-dramatic (although s/he may be enthusiastic in non-dramatic ways).
    5 = Teacher is dramatic, theatrical, creates suspense.

38. List any extenuating circumstances or unusual contraints which you think affected this teacher's ability to manage and organize this class. Some possible examples: unreasonable number of students (state number), unusual number of problem students in one class, great range of students' ability, inadequate equipment, supplies, space, furniture, etc.

39. If you observed both classes of this teacher, please comment on any differences you noticed between the two sections.

Appendix H

Narrative Reader Rating forms

Teacher____ Period____

JMIS Narrative Analysis Form

Reader_____

Dates (From)_____
(To)_____

No. of_____
Observations

After reading a set of narratives for a JMIS teacher, complete the following ratings, making notes and comments in the spaces provided to substantiate your ratings. You may wish to jot down comments and notes as you read, then rate and add comments as needed when you complete the whole set.

Unless a special scale is given with a particular variable, use the scale below in making all your ratings:

5 Description is highly characteristic of the teacher or class in this set of narratives

4 Description is characteristic of the teacher or class in this set of narratives

3 Description somewhat or occasionally characterizes the teacher or class

2 Description is not very characteristic of the teacher or class in this set of narratives

1 Description is never or not at all characteristic of the teacher in this set of narratives

---

5 4 3 2 1 (1) During the first 5 days of school, room is orderly, well organized. Materials and props are readily available and in place. Describe any problems.

5 4 3 2 1 (2) Teacher uses students as helpers for administrative and procedural jobs. Describe what jobs the students do and how teacher organizes these helpers.

5 4 3 2 1 *(3) Regular academic feedback to Ss (not including oral feedback to individual student responses). Describe kind of feedback.

*Scale:
- 5 Most students receive academic feedback in every observation (except the first day of school)
- 4 Most students receive academic feedback in most observations
- 3 Most students receive academic feedback in some observations
- 2 Most students receive academic feedback in one or two observations
- 1 Most students receive no academic feedback in any observation

5 4 3 2 1 (4) Work requirements are clear: due dates, form, standards of completeness, neatness, procedures for make-up work.

5 4 3 2 1 (5) Deadlines are enforced consistently; deadlines for completing work are not ignored or routinely extended. Teacher keeps track of papers turned in and papers due for each lesson.

5 4 3 2 1 (6) Consistent routines for communicating assignments to students (note regular postings, Ss assignment sheets, etc.). Describe.

5 4 3 2 1 (7) Effectively monitors student progress and completion of assignments. Inspects student work while in progress, by going around the room or by having students demonstrate or display their work at various times. Collects work or evaluates assignments regularly.

5 4 3 2 1 (8) Has regular and efficient routines for checking work in class, Ss turning in papers, and returning graded assignments. Describe problems.

5 4 3 2 1 (9) Procedures and rules are well taught: clear presentation, review, and subsequent reminders or corrections.

5 4 3 2 1 (10) Rewards or positive consequences for appropriate behavior are clearly defined. Guidelines for when and how rewards will be received are clear. Describe positive consequences.

5 4 3 2 1 (11) Rewards or positive consequences are used consistently. Describe teacher use. (Rewards may include privileges, posting work, citing good grades, as well as more overt strategies.)

5 4 3 2 1 (12) Negative consequences (penalties) are clearly defined. Penalties are stated in behavioral terms, i.e., are tied to specific behaviors. Ss will be able to state what behaviors are forbidden and what the number and duration of consequences will be for each behavior. Describe the negative consequences.

5 4 3 2 1 (13) Teacher follows through with negative consequences consistently. Describe how the teacher follows through.

5 4 3 2 1 (14) Teacher clearly ties class activities to grading system (daily work is graded; Ss receive grade credit for participation; free time activities are linked to some accountability system).

5 4 3 2 1 (15) System of consequences is appropriate, sufficient and effective.

5 4 3 2 1 (16) Teacher monitors at the beginning of activities. When a new activity begins the teacher is observant of whether the students are engaging in the activity.

5 4 3 2 1 (17) Effective conduct of transitions. Teacher supplies information or structure facilitating completion of present activity and preparation for next activity. Note any problems.

5 4 3 2 1 (18) There are frequent problems (at least once per observation) with Ss not bringing materials to class. (5=many problems)

5 4 3 2 1 (19) There are frequent problems (at least once per observation) with use of materials, supplies, and equipment in the classroom (materials are not on hand, insufficient supply, readable; equipment not working). (5=many problems)

5 4 3 2 1 (20) Teacher has to cope with frequent problems caused by interruptions from outside the class, noise from hall or next room, public address announcements, loud air conditioners. (5=many problems)

5 4 3 2 1 (21) There is often evidence that the needs of highest and lowest ability Ss in the classroom are not being met (particular Ss chronically confused, unsuccessful, uninvolved; particular Ss chronically finish work early and have nothing to do).

5 4 3 2 1 *(22) How often did the observer note digressions, irrelevant comments, and sustained interruptions during instructional presentations?

*Scale:
5 Two or three times per observation
4 Sometimes more than once per observation
3 One time per observation
2 Infrequently noted
1 Never noted

Describe the following:

(23) Teacher's establishment and maintenance of lines of communication with parents. (Teacher sends work home for signature; teacher mentions parent conference or calling parents; teacher sends class rules or course description to parents.)

(24) Ways in which the T deals with the wide range of children's abilities. (Use of small group instruction, extended help or repetition of instructions for particular Ss, differentiated assignments for gifted or lower ability Ss, extra credit or enrichment activities, structured peer tutoring.)

(25) Problem child/children in the class and how the T deals with them.

(26) Were rules (school and/or class) displayed in the room the first day of school? _____ Were they displayed after the first 3 weeks of school? _____
Did students copy or receive a copy of the rules (e.g., on a ditto)?_____

(27) Describe the room arrangement on the first day of school. Did the seating arrangement vary after the first of school?

Teacher____ Period____ Reader_____

Dates (From)_____
(To) _____

Information for Case Study Material

Mark with a (+) if this teacher's narratives present clear positive examples and mark with a (-) if they present clear negative examples of the following categories. Whenever possible, please indicate dates of outstanding narratives.

____1) Use of space and classroom readiness

____2) Teaching rules and procedures

____3) Appropriate positive consequences

____4) Appropriate negative consequences

____5) Following through with consequences

____6) First full day of school (e.g., smooth, disorganized)

____7) Monitoring during seatwork, transitions, etc.

____8) Stopping inappropriate behavior

____9) Presentations/clarification of lesson objectives

____10) Dealing with problem children

____11) Paired or grouped seatwork* (managing small group activities)

____12) Managing hands on (laboratory) activity*

____13) Small group instruction*

____14) Structuring transitions

____15) Clear directions

____16) Instruction for low-level students

____17) Management of long-term assignments (e.g., projects or assignments done over a period of time.)*

____18) Instruction for high-level students

____19) Dealing with heterogeneity

____20) Academic feedback

____21) Enforcing due dates

____22) Checking for student understanding; getting work samples during instruction

---

*Please list the dates of every observation of paired or group work (including laboratory) or small group instruction.

(6/28/82)

Teacher #_____ Period #_____ Date_____ Reader #_____

JMIS Narrative Coding Form 1

Time	Rule/procedure (P) or Consequence (C): N=New O=Old	Pupil participation L/D/S/M	Challenges	Strong Expectations	Affective Activity

Teacher #_____ Period #_____ Reader #_____

JMIS Form 2: Major Class Procedures

Procedural Area	Proc. Estab. Date	Describe Procedure	Proc. Modified? Date	Describe Modification	Rat.	Describe How It Worked
A. GENERAL						
1. Beginning class						
2. Tardiness						
3. Out-of-room						
4. Ending class						
B. WHOLE CLASS/ SEATWORK						
1. Student talk						
2. Response/Quest.						
3. Out-of-seat						
4. Work complete						
C. ACCOUNTABILITY						
1. Grading						
2. Work format						

H-11

Appendix I

Interview questions

Interview Protocol for JMIS Study
Spring 1982

Introductory Remarks

We want to first thank you for participating in this project and for making time for this interview. One purpose for this interview today is to discuss your perceptions of this management project, including the workshop, the manual, and the classroom observations. We'd also like to get a little more information about your background and training, and about your general approach to classroom management.

I have a list of specific questions that we would like to ask all of the teachers in the study, so you'll have to forgive me if I have to limit our discussion at some point so that we can cover all of them. If there is some time left at the end, we can go back and talk some more.

1. Where did you go to college, and when did you get your degree(s)? What are your degrees in?

2. We would like to know about your teaching experience. When this project began last Fall how many years of teaching experience had you had in junior high or middle schools? What about experience at other grade levels? What subjects had you taught?

3. Before school began last Fall what did you do to prepare for the beginning of school?

4. How did you develop the procedures and rules that you used in your classroom this year? (If this was not your first year) were they the same as you used last year or are they different?

5. (If different) what caused you to make changes? How satisfied were you with the changes that you made?

6. Do you think your participation in the project this year made any difference in the way you conducted your classes? How do you think these changes affected your students?

7. Do you think that your classes are running better or worse this year than in previous years (or than you had expected, if this was the first year), or are they about the same? Any reasons?

8. Is there any part of your classroom management you would change if you could? Are you planning to keep things pretty much as they are, or do you intend to make any specific changes next year?

9. We would like to know your opinion of the manual in general. Does the content seem appropriate to your grade level? Types of students? The subject or subjects you teach? Are there any major points that you disagree with or which don't work for your classes?

10. Can you think of any management areas or problems that were omitted from the manual or which you think should have received more extensive coverage? Is there anything specific for the subject you teach that could have been covered more thoroughly?

11. Were there any ideas in the manual that were <u>new</u> to you this year? Which?

12. What workshop activities were most appealing to you? Why?

13. What workshop activities were least appealing to you? Why?

14. We are aware that teachers have to cope with many problems and sources of stress. What do you find most stressful, frustrating, or discouraging in your present teaching situation?

15. How did having an observer from this project in your classroom affect you or your students this year?

16. Did you see the JMIS manual <u>before</u> you attended the workshop?

17. We would like to know about the different sources of information or assistance that you had with regard to classroom management. I have a short list of possible sources and I'd like you to comment on the extent to which each of them helped you in the area of classroom management.

    a. Undergraduate university courses
    b. Graduate level university courses
    c. School district inservice programs (other than this program)
    d. Building principal or other building administrator
    e. Other teachers in your building (Is there an active community or academic department?)
    f. Supervisors or other district personnel
    g. Professional organizations
    h. Other

18. Finally, we would like to ask you a general question: What goals do you have for your students; or what do you hope to accomplish in your classroom?

****

From beginning-school workshop teachers remember to pick up the one page manual questionnaire. Check to be sure they have answered the attached new rating. Get the teacher's signature on the authorization form.

Appendix J

Means and ANOVA results for Weeks 1-8,

all variables, by instrument

(Tables A - E)

Table A

Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance on Component Rating Variables

Component Ratings (5-point rating scale)	Means for groups			Means for time periods				Interaction
	Treatment (n = 18)	Control (n = 20)	p	Week 1	Weeks 2 to 4	Weeks 5 to 8	p	p
Describes objectives clearly	3.35	3.05	ns	3.17	3.17	3.26	ns	ns
Variety of materials	1.65	1.69	ns	1.61	1.68	1.73	ns	ns
Materials are ready	4.47	4.40	ns	4.38	4.38	4.54	ns	ns
Clear directions	3.91	3.68	ns	3.77	3.65	3.96	.05	ns
Waits for attention	3.84	3.30	.02	3.69	3.44	3.57	ns	ns
Encourages analysis/builds reasoning skills	2.95	2.66	ns	2.58	2.93	2.91	.04	ns
Assignments and activities for different students	1.29	1.25	ns	1.24	1.22	1.35	ns	.05
Appropriate pacing of lessons	3.64	3.37	ns	3.50	3.40	3.62	ns	ns
Clear explanations and presentations	3.77	3.49	ns	3.55	3.47	3.87	<.01	ns
Monitors student understanding	3.72	3.19	<.01	3.19	3.54	3.64	<.01	ns
Consistently enforces work standards	3.68	3.12	.01	3.25	3.35	3.61	<.01	ns
Suitable traffic patterns	4.16	4.04	ns	4.02	4.03	4.26	.01	ns
Efficient administrative routines	4.14	3.75	.01	3.80	3.94	4.11	<.01	ns

Table A, continued

Component Ratings (5-point rating scale)	Means for groups			Means for time periods				Interaction
	Treatment (n = 18)	Control (n = 20)	p	Week 1	Weeks 2 to 4	Weeks 5 to 8	p	p
Appropriate general procedures	3.88	3.43	.03	3.65	3.59	3.73	ns	ns
Suitable routines for assigning, checking, collecting work	3.85	3.51	.02	3.51	3.63	3.90	<.01	ns
Efficient opening and closing routines	3.67	3.02	<.001	3.20	3.36	3.49	.05	ns
Student success	4.05	3.77	.10	3.84	3.84	4.05	.04	ns
Student agression	1.06	1.18	.03	1.08	1.14	1.14	ns	ns
Attention spans considered in lesson	3.62	3.28	.06	3.43	3.40	3.52	ns	ns
Activities related to student interests/backgrounds	2.61	2.42	ns	2.71	2.46	2.37	.04	ns
Restrictions on student discretionary behaviors	3.75	3.05	<.001	3.63	3.25	3.31	<.01	ns
Rewards appropriate performance	2.50	1.94	.03	2.16	2.23	2.28	ns	ns
Consistency in managing behavior	3.70	3.14	.02	3.40	3.34	3.52	ns	ns
Effective monitoring	3.87	3.10	<.001	3.44	3.45	3.56	ns	ns
Amount of disruption	1.31	1.53	ns	1.34	1.35	1.57	.02	ns

Table A, continued

Component Ratings (5-point rating scale)	Means for groups: Treatment (n = 18)	Means for groups: Control (n = 20)	p	Means for time periods: Week 1	Means for time periods: Weeks 2 to 4	Means for time periods: Weeks 5 to 8	p	Interaction p
Source of disruption	2.14	2.38	ns	2.38	2.08	2.32	ns	.03
Cites rules or procedures to stop disruption	2.17	2.07	ns	1.88	2.09	2.39	ns	ns
Uses desist statements to stop disruptions	2.69	2.94	ns	3.03	2.18	3.24	ns	ns
Uses penalties to stop disruptions	2.93	1.70	.05	2.16	2.18	2.61	ns	ns
Amount of inappropriate behavior	2.13	2.63	.06	2.35	2.34	2.46	ns	ns
Source of inappropriate behavior	2.37	2.80	.05	2.50	2.53	2.72	ns	ns
Stops inappropriate behavior quickly	3.86	3.18	<.01	3.54	3.44	3.59	ns	ns
Cites rules or procedures to stop inappropriate behavior	2.65	2.07	.02	2.41	2.44	2.22	ns	ns
Uses desist statement to stop inappropriate behavior	2.91	2.94	ns	2.60	2.76	3.40	<.001	ns
Criticizes to stop inappropriate behavior	1.18	1.18	ns	1.10	1.21	1.22	.06	ns
Uses penalties to stop inappropriate behavior	1.62	1.57	ns	1.48	1.57	1.73	ns	ns
Ignores inappropriate behavior	2.25	2.89	.01	2.70	2.47	2.54	ns	ns

Table A, continued

Component Ratings (5-point rating scale)	Means for groups			Means for time periods				Interaction
	Treatment (n = 18)	Control (n = 20)	p	Week 1	Weeks 2 to 4	Weeks 5 to 8	p	p
Conveys value of curriculum	2.90	2.45	.08	2.76	2.78	2.49	.10	ns
Students have task-oriented focus	3.79	3.41	.05	3.63	3.61	3.56	ns	ns
Class has relaxed, pleasant atmosphere	3.68	3.55	ns	3.62	3.63	3.59	ns	ns
Teacher has distracting mannerisms	1.19	1.10	ns	1.13	1.23	1.08	.07	ns
Teacher displays listening skills	3.59	3.36	ns	3.48	3.40	3.56	ns	ns
Manages interruptions	4.28	3.93	.04	4.11	3.96	4.26	ns	ns
Avoidance behavior during seatwork	2.01	2.23	ns	1.86	2.23	2.26	<.01	ns
Participation in discussion/ recitation	3.17	3.10	ns	2.96	3.17	3.28	.09	ns

Table B

T-test Between Treatment and Control Teachers

on Addendum Component Ratings

Addendum Component Ratings (5-point rating scale)	Treatment mean (n = 18)	Control mean (n = 20)	p
Teacher presents, reviews, or discusses classroom rules or procedures	3.09	2.61	.06
Presentation of rules, procedures, and penalties is clear	3.92	3.69	ns
Presentation includes explanation of rationale for rules and procedures	3.05	2.77	ns
Rehearsal or practice of procedures is included for presentation/ review of rules and procedures	1.96	1.43	.07
Teacher provides feedback and review	2.93	2.32	.04
Teacher stays in charge of all students, avoiding long involvement with individuals or small groups and absence from the room	4.59	4.38	ns

Table C

T-test Between Treatment and Control Teachers

On Observer Ratings of Teachers

Observer Ratings (5-point rating scale)	Treatment mean (n = 18)	Control mean (n = 20)	p
Readiness of class for remainder of year	4.14	3.47	.05
Teacher lets class gets out of hand with half or more pupils off task	1.68	2.51	.03
Frequency of wandering that is not task related	1.57	2.28	.02
Noise level of classroom in general	2.01	2.90	.02
Teacher's expectation regarding talk among students during seatwork	2.39	2.93	.06
Efficiency of transitions between activities or formats	4.07	3.45	.03
Frequency of come-ups while teacher is engaged with other students	1.85	2.36	.06
Frequency with which students:			
Approach teacher when need help	2.28	3.11	<.01
Raise hands when need help from teacher	3.87	3.27	.001
Call out when need help from teacher	2.01	2.91	<.01
How well the teacher handles disruptions	4.23	3.50	.04
Efficient use of available classroom space	4.02	3.75	ns
Teacher consistently plans enough work for students	4.47	3.72	.001

Table C, continued

Observer Ratings (5-point rating scale)	Treatment mean (n = 18)	Control mean (n = 20)	p
Teacher allows activities to continue too long	2.23	2.54	ns
Typical assignments are too short or easy	1.62	2.07	.03
When giving instructions, teacher questions to determine student understanding	3.61	3.17	ns
Teacher was successful in holding students accountable for work	4.13	3.55	.03
Effective routines for communicating assignments	4.25	3.62	.01
Frequency of academic feedback:			
Grades on papers	3.73	3.34	ns
Papers on bulletin boards	1.52	1.50	ns
Verbal citing of students in front of class	2.08	1.67	.10
Individual conferences with teacher	2.22	1.69	.06
Evaluative comments to class as whole	3.21	2.72	.06
Teacher was confident and relaxed the first weeks of school	3.63	3.59	ns
Teacher was warm and pleasant toward the children	3.53	3.54	ns
Teacher was enthusiastic	3.50	3.14	ns
Showmanship of teacher	2.59	2.36	ns

Table D

Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance of Student Engagement Ratings

Student Engagement Ratings	Means for groups			Means for time periods				Interaction
	Treatment (n = 18)	Control (n = 20)	p	Week 1	Weeks 2 to 4	Weeks 5 to 8	p	p
Average success rating	4.06	3.79	ns	3.69	3.9[illegible]	4.13	.04	ns
Definitely on task, academic	.49	.50	ns	.33	.59	.58	<.001	ns
Definitely on task, procedural	.34	.27	.02	.47	.22	.23	<.001	ns
Off task, sanctioned	.04	.05	ns	.05	.03	.05	ns	ns
Off task, unsanctioned	.04	.06	.04	.04	.05	.06	<.01	ns
Dead time	.02	.03	.08	.03	.02	.03	ns	.02
On task, academic	.53	.55	ns	.36	.65	.62	<.001	ns
On task, procedural	.38	.30	.02	.53	.24	.25	<.001	ns
On task	.91	.85	.01	.88	.89	.86	.07	ns

Table E

T-test Between Treatment and Control Group Teachers

On Narrative Reader Ratings

Narrative Ratings (5-point rating scale)	Treatment mean (n = 18)	Control mean (n = 20)	p
During the first 5 days of school, room is orderly, well organized	4.28	3.90	.07
Teacher uses students as helpers for administrative and procedural jobs	2.31	2.55	ns
Regular academic feedback to students	3.64	3.20	.10
Work requirements are clear	3.72	3.25	.06
Deadlines are enforced consistently	3.64	3.25	.06
Consistent routines for communicating assignments to students	3.97	3.28	<.01
Effectively monitors students' progress and completion of assignments	3.83	3.33	.02
Regular, efficient routines for checking, turning in, and grading work	3.81	3.28	.03
Procedures and rules are well taught	3.86	3.10	<.01
Rewards or positive consequences for appropriate behavior are clearly defined	2.28	1.65	.07
Rewards or positive consequences are used consistently	2.28	1.75	.10
Negative consequences are clearly defined	3.22	2.80	ns
Teacher follows through with negative consequences consistently	3.08	2.13	.001
Teacher clearly ties class activities to grading system	3.56	3.28	ns
System of consequences is appropriate, sufficient, and effective	3.53	2.63	<.01

Table E, continued

Narrative Ratings (5-point rating scale)	Treatment mean (n = 18)	Control mean (n = 20)	p
Teacher monitors at the beginning of activities	3.61	2.95	<.01
Effective conduct of transitions	3.64	3.08	.02
Frequent problems with students not bringing materials to class	2.06	1.95	ns
Frequent problems with use of materials, supplies, equipment in class	1.50	2.10	<.01
Frequent problems caused by interruptions outside class	2.56	2.35	ns
Needs of highest and lowest ability students are not being met	2.14	2.50	ns
Frequency of digressions, irrelevant comments, sustained interruptions during instruction	1.75	1.93	ns
Problems with beginning class procedures	2.25	2.75	.08
Problems with tardiness procedures	2.14	2.13	ns
Problems with students leaving room	1.67	1.98	ns
Problems with ending class procedures	1.94	2.48	.04
Problems with student talk during whole class/seatwork activities	2.86	3.50	.02
Problems with response/questions during whole class/seatwork activities	2.61	2.98	ns
Problems with students out-of-seat during whole class/seatwork activities	2.14	2.98	<.001
Problems with students after they complete work during whole class/seatwork activities	2.36	3.00	.02